

chief of staff in complete dominance and control of our military forces, policy, and organization.

A glance at Congressional history reveals that this proposal has been pushed with vigor and force many times in the past 75 years. Congress, in committee and as a whole, has repeatedly and in great detail examined the philosophy and functioning of this method of military control, developed by and adopted from the Prussian system. The purported advantages have been aired and investigated and it has been concluded by our predecessors, in each and every instance, that advantages did not exist. As a matter of fact, the conclusion has been that monumental disadvantages and dangers would exist if a supreme general staff-single chief of staff was authorized. This repeated rejection by Congress of the system that led the Prussian-German people to disastrous defeat twice within 30 years is an example of the astuteness and soundness of our Congressional-legislative process. I have no fear that examination of this present proposal under objective conditions will once again result in its complete and unqualified rejection.

There is one area of this matter that I believe deserves special mention in the light of today's thinking and current conditions. The shield behind which the present sponsors and advocates of this single chief of staff scheme advance is the shield of economy. This, incidentally, indicates the clever manner in which this proposition is being promoted. All of us are vitally and sincerely interested in the question of Government expenditures and economy. Adoption of this system, from a military and national policy standpoint, would be inviting; yes, almost assuring, a debilitation of our military power and effectiveness. Leaving that aside for the moment, however, I would like to examine the economy claim we read so much about these days.

Our best yardstick, it would seem, to measure organizational efficiency is found in the business-industrial systems of our country. These organizations are continually subjected to the test of practical application and if they fail they disappear. Competition provides the test. Our industrial and business leaders of today are agreed that the greatest efficiency is developed by a decentralized organization. The more successful business enterprises have found that decentralization increases efficiency and econ-

omy, and thus builds a stronger and sounder organization. Whereas 50 years ago the single industrial emperor dominated the business scene, this strong man has today virtually disappeared—the victim of progress and efficient organization.

To adopt a single Chief of Staff—completely unified military organization would be to follow a path of retrogression and to saddle ourselves with a system proven to be uneconomical, as well as inefficient. True, we are dealing with military, not business, organization. But every indication is that it would be just as uneconomical in its military application as in business. This was pointed out by Secretary of Defense Wilson, as quoted in the New York Times of May 17, where it was stated:

Secretary Wilson said he had been trying to "overcome the handicap of bigness" for 20 years as president of General Motors. He said neither money nor paperwork would be saved by putting the services "all together in one big pot."

The handicap of bigness that Secretary Wilson mentioned as a great problem at General Motors would be dwarfed by the handicap imposed by merging the services into one gigantic combine. Suppose you take the assets of General Motors, American Telephone & Telegraph, United States Steel, Standard Oil Company of the United States, Du Pont, and General Electric as a starter for comparison. Add to them the assets of more than 30 of the other leading corporations of the country. The resulting combination in business size, and complexity, would be less than half of the aggregate if the 3 military departments' assets were lumped into one pot. Any man who seriously claimed that it would be good business management to merge some 40 of the largest business concerns of the country into one gigantic firm would be a candidate for mental examination.

Furthermore, no matter how economical, the security and safety of the United States, as well as its traditional constitutional civilian control of the military, would prevent adoption of the supreme general staff-single chief of staff concept.

In addition to the searching Congressional inquiry in this field, the question was the subject of much attention by the Hoover Commission. This organization, dedicated without question to efficiency

and economy, rejected on all counts the supreme general staff organization.

The present organization, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, provides us with the safest and surest method of advising on and carrying out our national policy. The victory of our Nation in two World Wars, when contrasted with the utter failure of the German supreme high command is ample evidence of the efficiency of this type system.

The JCS organization has been repeatedly examined in Congress and in each instance determined to be the best and soundest organizational form available. The Hoover Commission Task Force Committee on National Security concluded that there should be no change in our organization of military direction.

In dealing with this, the Task Force Report of the Hoover Commission concluded:

There has been much loose criticism of the war efforts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as constituting command by committee; yet there can be no doubt whatsoever that in the field of grand strategy a meeting of several minds is far safer—and in the end more sound—than the dictates of one. The responsibilities for strategic planning and the conduct of war are soundly placed by the National Security Act upon the shoulders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who, in turn, are under the authority, and subject to the control of, the President and the Secretary of Defense. There should be no change in this concept.

The fallacious cloak of economy and efficiency once again has been wrapped around the single chief-of-staff idea in an effort to make it more acceptable to the people of the United States. Regardless of what form it takes or what cover it has, this concept can spell naught else but trouble and disaster for the United States. It would not be a panacea, it would be an anathema—on our way of life and our constitutional form of government. I would not cry "Wolf" or "Beware of the man on horseback." But any man worth his salt and placed in the position of Chief of the Supreme General Staff, or whatever it might be denominated, would naturally and automatically acquire powers far beyond those envisaged by the Constitution. This era of total war would make this system intolerable to everyone in our country, however he may be engaged, without practical exception, for its impact would be felt and borne by all.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, turning from memorial wreaths and from the fluttering flags on countless grassy mounds, we come once more to face the never-ending struggle to maintain, preserve, and defend the freedoms which have been bought for us at so crimson a cost. From sea to sea of the homeland this May

morning, where the grass has been trod by reverent feet, and in sacred patches of alien soil where is kept the bivouac of our valiant dead, we are conscious of the crosses and the flags blending in their mute testimony, knowing that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, especially as we front foes whose only law is expediency. In these days of destiny, as we fight democracy's battle, at home and abroad, may those crosses and those flags speak to us of strength that is increased by its spending, of life that is saved by its losing, and of greatness that is measured by its serving. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One

who gave His life a ransom for many. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1957.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK CARLSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARLSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT OF MEDALS OF HONOR ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith S. 1463 entitled "An act to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 31, 1957.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7665) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7665) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks that the unanimous-consent agreement entered on May 29, and relating to the proceedings today, be read.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate adjourn until Friday, May 31, 1957, at noon; that on said day only requests for the insertion of matters in the Record shall be in order under a 3-minute limitation of debate; and that at the conclusion of its business on said day the Senate shall adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, June 3, 1957.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order just read be modified to the extent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] be extended the privilege of addressing the Senate for not to exceed 30 minutes.

I also ask unanimous consent that the order be modified so as to permit the introduction of bills or joint resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTION OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT IN LIFTING THE EMBARGO ON COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the British Government has announced the lifting of the embargo against shipments of certain materials to Communist China. Many of the articles now to be shipped to Communist China must be considered strategic by any rule of reason. Locomotives, machine tools, trucks, perhaps entire rubber plants, may some day in the not too distant future strengthen Communist China to the point where it can feel it dares take the risk of taking over the Crown Colony of Hong Kong.

This is a calculated risk for which Her Majesty's ministers must alone bear the responsibility. When they weaken their own forces in Europe, as was recently done, we might question the wisdom of it; but as good and stout allies, we understand some of the economic reasons behind their action.

But, Mr. President, it is far more difficult to understand an action which can only strengthen our common enemies both in Asia and in Europe, for, Mr. President, up to the present time, Communist China has not agreed to a peace treaty with Korea; it has violated the armistice agreements in Korea; it has violated the armistice agreements in Southeast Asia, it still holds American citizens in prison.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the body of the Record, as a part of my remarks, the official statement of the United States State Department, issued today, relative to the British action; and also an article entitled "Lifting Red China Embargo Termed Helpful to Russia," which was published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT ON CHINA

The United Kingdom has decided that it can no longer agree to maintain a level of security controls over its exports to Communist China more severe than the multilateral controls applied to the U. S. S. R. and the Soviet bloc countries in Europe.

The United States is most disappointed by this action. It means that an agreement for the continuation of a differential trade control toward Communist China has not been reached, even though many of the nations which have been engaged in the recent talks on this subject expressed their support for such a program. For its part, the United States contemplates no change in its policy of total embargo on trade with Communist China.

AGREE TO PROPOSAL

The recent discussions among the cooperating governments have revealed that there was a wish on the part of all countries to retain a unified approach on the question of trade controls on exports to Communist China. A majority of the countries, including the United States, sought a unanimous agreement on the maintenance of a differential. The United States believed that the security interests of the free world would be best promoted by the maintenance of a significant differential. After an initial difference of opinion on the precise extent of the differential, the United States agreed to a proposal developed by representatives of a number of the participating countries. This proposal obtained the support of a majority of the cooperating governments.

BRITAIN'S STAND

The United Kingdom, however, supported by some countries, believed that there was no merit in applying a different level of controls to trade with Communist China as compared with the Soviet Union and that this differential should be totally abolished. No one advocated any reduction in the existing security controls applying to exports to the Soviet bloc countries in Europe, which controls would also continue to apply to Communist China.

The British policy announcement on China controls, while at variance with the position which the United States sought in the recent talks, makes clear the intention of the British Government to continue the application of security controls on strategic exports to Communist China, on the same basis as is presently being applied to the Soviet bloc countries of Europe.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 31, 1957]

LIFTING RED CHINA EMBARGO TERMED HELPFUL TO RUSSIA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—Sometimes it seems that, if the Communists only wait long enough, they will outtrade and outmaneuver the West. For apparently the alliance of the free world is not sufficiently sturdy or patient enough at times to maintain unity against the common enemy.

Pressed by British businessmen who want to sell their goods, the London government now has decided to relax its embargo on trade with Red China. Without getting a single concession in return, the British Government has yielded to the Red Chinese and will ship to them many of the commodities which hitherto have been banned.

This will strengthen Red China and help industrialize a country which is hostile to the West.

The United States Government is disappointed over the action and has said so publicly.

The British, on the other hand, are repeating a fallacious argument they have made often in the past—namely, that, since the goods can go into Soviet Russia, it is illogical to bar direct shipment to Red China of goods now going there indirectly.

BURDEN ON RUSSIA

The answer is that at present it costs the Soviets and the Red Chinese lots of money and takes a great deal of valuable freight space to send the goods over the trans-Siberian railway from Russia to China. Likewise, it is expensive to send by long sea voyage from Britain cargoes that can only be landed either in eastern European ports or carried to Siberian coastal ports—and all this with great difficulty and delay in certain seasons of the year.

Why should things be made easier for the Red Chinese, and the expenses of Soviet Russia cut down and her internal burden

with scarce goods eased? These are questions which the British have not satisfactorily answered. It is known here that an influential lobby in England has been steadily pressing the Conservative government to relax the trade embargo. Britain exists to no small extent on world trade, and it is a sad fact that, even in the early years of World War I, some British businessmen traded with the enemy, much to the discomfiture of the United States, then a neutral, whose goods were stopped at the time on the high seas even when destined for other neutral countries.

WAYS TO OFFSET LOSSES

The power of the trader in politics is well established. In a sense, the losers in business could be taken care of through indemnities or through purchase of surpluses. After all, if a trade embargo will help to keep the Communist countries weak and if, through trade embargoes, the military machine of a potential combatant can be kept from reaching effectiveness, the people of many Western countries might rather see the business interests compensated in some other way.

Now the Red China regime is to have access to tractors, trucks, locomotives, generators, and other vital commodities hitherto embargoed. It could lead to a breakdown of controls on the really strategic items, too. It may be the beginning of the crumbling of the alliance that has thus far kept the economic sinews of the West from helping the Communists of both Soviet Russia and Red China.

AGREEMENT WAS VOLUNTARY

It is too early to tell how Congress will react to the change made by the British. Long and earnest efforts were made in vain by the State Department to persuade the London government not to relax the embargo. Each government, of course, decides for itself, as there is no control over the policies of independent nations. Whatever has been agreed heretofore has been by voluntary action.

But if the alliance breaks down, America will have to make her own decision with respect to other phases of the embargo. Will American companies, for instance, furnish the British vendors with any goods to ship to Communist China? The rule here is that the same ban will be maintained as before on American exports, but it will be much harder to police this now since the British have begun to let down the bars.

Fifteen countries have been meeting in Paris for more than a month trying to work out a unanimous agreement on maintaining the embargo, but the talks broke down because the British wanted to go it alone.

It is an unfortunate development and must be marked up as a signal victory for the Communists in the cold war. It was handed to them on a platter by Great Britain.

GAIL BORDEN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, history is compounded of many things—war, disaster, battles, retreats, victories, conferences, treaties, and mass migrations. It is also the story of men—some good, some bad, and some who have stamped their dreams and their visions indelibly on our daily lives for all the years to come.

This is the centennial of such a man—of Gail Borden, who was responsible for one of the most familiar and most necessary objects of our civilization.

Gail Borden was a restless man with an inquiring mind that roamed as widely as his physical wanderings. He had lived in almost every State, from New York to Mississippi, when he arrived in Texas at the age of 28. He had been a surveyor

in Kentucky; a captain of militia in Indiana; a flatboat crewman on the Mississippi River; and a schoolteacher in the State of Mississippi.

In Texas—then a part of Mexico—he combined the occupations of surveying, farming, and ranching. In between, he found time to help write the first State constitution, run the land office, and publish the first permanent newspaper in that area.

When Texas became a republic, President Sam Houston named Gail Borden as its first collector of customs, with an office at Galveston. He became interested in real estate and laid out the city of Houston, today the largest city in the South.

All during this period he had tinkered with a number of inventions. None of them had achieved any commercial success, even though his meat biscuit did carry off 1 of the 5 prizes awarded to Americans at the London World's Fair in 1851.

In the mid-1850's, he began the experiments which eventually led to immortality. He tackled a problem which was one of the greatest that faced our ancestors—how to assure a supply of pure milk, especially for children, that would be safe, and could be transported for long distances.

Borden thought the answer might lie in condensation. He poured into the project enthusiasm, vigor, and his own money—so much so, that within a few years he was reduced from a man in fairly comfortable circumstances to a man deeply in debt.

They were hard years for Borden. He finally obtained a patent; and on May 11, 1857, he started the world's first condensary, in Connecticut, where he would be near the largest possible market.

He was 60 years old, in debt, and starting a brandnew venture. Twice he went broke, and had to close down. The third time, he managed to break even; and from there on, it was only a question of holding on until the flood of orders started to pour in.

When he died—west of Houston—in 1874, he was known as "the world's milkman," and his condensed milk was a "must" for mothers everywhere. It remains a "must" to this day.

I do not have to tell you, Mr. President, of the tremendous impact his invention has on society, even today. It has become such a familiar, everyday object that most Americans do not realize that there was a living, breathing, and very vital man behind it.

Before he died, Gail Borden summed up his own life in the epitaph he selected. It was:

I tried and failed,
I tried again and again, and succeeded.

Mr. President, I commend to you these lines, along with the man who changed the whole history of this country as much as any other American.

A CONNECTICUT YANKEE FROM TEXAS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, for this occasion I have prepared some remarks entitled "A Connecticut Yankee From Texas." I hope they will appear in the

Record following the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

I feel that I would be doing less than my duty as a Connecticut citizen if I did not take time here to pay tribute to a noted frontiersman who came to Connecticut from Texas to found the modern dairy industry in Connecticut 100 years ago this month.

I can pay tribute to this Texan because he was in reality a New Englander who came home. I speak of Gail Borden, whose people landed in New England in the 1630's, and have enriched the life of my section ever since.

Some of the members of the Borden family who landed in New England wandered off. And one, Gail Borden, got all the way to Texas, where he utilized his New England sense of conscience and industry to help get that infant Republic and later Lone Star State underway.

Parenthetically, I should not want that statement to be indirectly assumed to be a suggestion of any lack of conscience or industry in the great State of Texas, but we can point with a little pride to those elements and characteristics of Gail Borden, which were useful at that time.

That same sense of conscience also made him aware that the high mortality rate among infant children should not be dismissed with a shrug and a gloomy, "It's the will of God." Gail Borden believed that it was his duty to help alleviate human suffering and to pave the way for a stronger and healthier Nation. His attention centered on the need of pure milk—a milk which could be transported on long treks and stay pure and sweet, to provide nourishment to all, and particularly those far from the source of supply.

Accordingly, he established headquarters in and near present-day Torrington, in my home State of Connecticut, to work with the farmers of that region to improve the quality of milk, and to manufacture the lifegiving product of his own invention—condensed milk. He chose our specific area for the reason that men with ideas have frequently chosen Connecticut—the intelligent, energetic, and progressive outlook of the Connecticut citizenry; the proximity to financial institutions; and the availability of a large consuming market.

It was in Connecticut that he opened the world's first successful condensary, starting a business new to America. The official founding date is May 11, 1857; the place: Burrville. This infant business, held together for several years, as have so many other fledgling Connecticut institutions, largely on the slender thread of faith, and not much else.

But the business founded by Gail Borden, like others in our historic State, provided a product based on need, and stressing quality, in his case milk that was pure and would stay sweet for long periods of time. The condensed milk first made by Gail Borden in Connecticut played a key role in America's years of westward expansion and in helping build the healthy Nation we are today. Until his product became available, westward-bound caravans had one thing in common—the cow tied to the tailboard of every covered wagon. Connecticut-made

condensed milk came to the rescue of the migrating families of pioneers, assuring them of sustenance and good health in the then distant western reaches of America.

Connecticut is proud to possess such characteristics that a man like Gail Borden would choose it to get his real start in life—and he did not get this start until he was 56 years of age on his return to our State. And Connecticut is proud that through his effort, this State is the birthplace of the modern dairy industry—an industry which has grown nationally so dramatically that today it produces \$10 billion worth of nutritious dairy foods. It is with great pride that the State of Connecticut salutes Gail Borden on this centennial of his lasting contribution to American life and health.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement for the benefit of Senators. On Monday it is planned to consider the

House Commerce appropriation conference report, if the House acts on it by that time.

The Senate may also consider Calendar No. 328, S. 1770, amending the retirement laws for the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department, and other police officers;

Calendar No. 338, H. R. 53, consolidating certain Veterans' Administration laws;

Calendar No. 337, H. R. 4136, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank may make loans;

Calendar No. 318, S. 1740, relating to beneficial associations and the employees' life-insurance fund.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS AS OF MAY 31

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the status of appropriation bills as of May 31, including the title of the bill, the subcommittee chairman, the date the bill passed the House, and the status in the Senate.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of appropriation bills as of May 31

Bill	Subcommittee chairman	Passed House	Status
1. 2d urgent deficiency, 1957....	Hayden.....	Apr. 15	Passed Senate Apr. 16; approved Apr. 16, Public Law 15.
2. Additional deficiency, 1957....	do.....	Apr. 17	Passed Senate Apr. 18; approved Apr. 20, Public Law 19.
3. Treasury-Post Office.....	Robertson.....	Feb. 20	Passed Senate May 13; approved May 28, Public Law 37.
4. State-Justice.....	Johnson.....	Apr. 17	Passed Senate May 15. At White House.
5. General government matters.....	Magnuson.....	Mar. 13	Passed Senate May 22. At White House.
6. 3d supplemental, 1957.....	Hayden.....	May 7	Passed Senate May 20. Conference report ready for House action Monday.
7. Commerce.....	Holland.....	Apr. 9	Passed Senate May 17. Conference report ready for House action.
8. Interior.....	Hayden.....	Feb. 26	Marked up.
9. Independent offices.....	Magnuson.....	Mar. 20	Hearings not quite completed; 1 or 2 more days in June.
10. Labor-HEW.....	Hill.....	Apr. 4	Hearings concluded. Markup next week.
11. District of Columbia.....	Pastore.....	Apr. 8	Do.
12. Agriculture.....	Russell.....	May 15	Hearings concluded. Markup June 5.
13. Legislative.....	Stennis.....	May 23	Senate hearings not scheduled.
14. Defense.....	Chavez.....	May 29	Senate hearings started May 23.
15. Public works.....	Ellender.....		Senate and House holding hearings simultaneously. House may report next week.
16. Mutual security.....	Hayden.....		Waiting for action on authorization.
17. Supplemental for 1958.....	Full committee.....		

I hope we can continue our work on the appropriation bills with the same efficiency and expedition that has marked our conduct thus far. We have tried to be both careful and expeditious, and I believe that if we stay on the track we will be able to dispose of these bills in good time.

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY—RESOLUTION OF OREGON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—STATEMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the future of the family farm today presents a question that has yet to be answered with any assurance of its survival as a fundamental American institution. State legislature bodies and farm organizations are among those urging that the problem of preserving the family size farm be solved before it is too late.

I have received a copy of House Memorial No. 3, which was adopted by the House of Representatives of the Oregon Legislature during their recent session, which urges congressional action in behalf of the family-type farm operator,

whose net income from all sources does not exceed \$10,000 per year.

I have also received a statement of a similar nature issued by the board of directors of the Oregon Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Memorial No. 3, and the statement from the Oregon Farmers Union may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Memorial 3

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas Congress has, through the years, devoted much time, effort, and money on legislative programs pertaining to our agricultural economy; and

Whereas it is generally conceded that a reasonable degree of prosperity and agricultural income is necessary at the grassroots level; and

Whereas the family type farm operator is regarded as an essential part of our democratic form of government and any Federal legislation designed to influence or maintain a measure of the economic parity between the rural and urban areas should be so designed that the major provisions thereof provide a substantial benefit to the family type farm operator; and

Whereas in recent years, acts of Congress appear to have granted special privileges to corporate and absentee ownership types of farm operations and to a large extent have ignored the family type farm operator: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation or amend the various Federal laws pertaining to agriculture to the end that the economic benefits provided in such laws be basically directed toward the family type farm operator whose net income from all sources does not exceed \$10,000 per year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house May 13, 1957.

EDITH BYNON LOW,

Chief Clerk.

PAT DOOLEY,

Speaker of the House.

STATEMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, OREGON FARMERS UNION

Long recognized as the solid social and economic core of American agriculture, the family farm is fighting a desperate battle for survival.

So designed by size and diversification as to gainfully employ the services of the farmer and his family and return an adequate standard of American living, the family farmer finds his future imperiled by the squeeze of mounting production costs and falling commodity prices.

He faces the handicap—along with the small-business man—of the crippling effects of the high-interest hard-money policy on both cost and availability of sufficient credit.

The family farmer has been forced into the ropes by the administration of the sliding scale of diminishing returns and a program of support prices geared only to a few basic crops and not spread to afford protection to the production of a diversified farm.

He has been discriminated against by a program so managed as to provide unfair and unbalanced competition by determinedly refusing to limit the total amount of price protection to the individual, but that has permitted and sponsored payments of excessive sums to large mechanized and incorporated land companies and individual holdings.

The family farms of this State and Nation have diminished in the last few years at a rate that should be the real concern, not only of the farmers who produce, but of the consumers who depend upon a substantial and adequate supply of food products.

Labor, faced with the challenge of automation, has problems of its own and cannot well absorb all these people who leave the land, nor do we concede that the ranks of transient labor offer reasonable answer for the family farmer.

We do not believe the consuming public will ever gain any long-range benefits of price, or security of food supply, by the coming of monopolies into the field of food production.

Therefore, it is our intention now to respectfully memorialize the Congress of these United States to give immediate attention to the present plight of the family farmer and to devise measures realistically designed

to help this vitally necessary type of productive unit.

We would respectfully point out that unless some sense of responsibility for land controls and for an equitable and stabilized price program is soon established, the family farm faces extinction.

The loss of this long recognized institution of agricultural production is certain to have serious adverse social and economic impacts upon the security of America.

THE LATE SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY—RESOLUTION BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 29, the Committee on Government Operations held its first meeting since the passing of our late colleague, Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin. On behalf of the chairman of the committee [Mr. McCLELLAN] and as the ranking Republican member of the committee, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point the memorial resolution adopted by the committee:

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

Whereas the late junior Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable Joseph R. McCarthy, served with distinction as a member of this committee for a period of more than 10 years, 2 of which he served as chairman; and

Whereas during the entire period of his service in the Senate he was a member of this committee and participated actively in its deliberations and activities, and contributed much to its legislative accomplishments, particularly with reference to the improvement of budgeting, accounting and financial reporting, in the development of better procurement, property and records management procedures, the disposal of surplus Federal property, and in effecting reorganizations of the executive branch of the Government; and

Whereas for 2 years he served as the chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of this committee, during which time he conducted a most aggressive and courageous fight against communism, striving constantly to awaken the American people to the threat of the international Communist conspiracy to our Government and the institutions upon which it was founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret of the death of the Honorable Joseph R. McCarthy, late junior Senator from the State of Wisconsin; and directs its clerk to transmit a copy of this resolution to his wife, Mrs. Jean McCarthy, to his daughter, Tierney Elizabeth, and to other members of the family of the deceased.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of MAINE, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 2189. A bill to promote the increase and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2190. A bill to waive the \$1,000 limitation on the authority of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the settlement and payment of claims arising out of the crash of a United States Navy airplane at Minneapolis, Minn., on May 30, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FURTELL, Mr. GORE, Mr. THYE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2191. A bill to amend title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2192. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2193. A bill to amend section 8 of the act approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474), relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Colorado by providing for the use of public lands granted to said State for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. NEELY and Mr. BEALL):

S. 2194. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Hospital Center and facilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED RICHARD E. BYRD ANTARCTIC COMMISSION ACT OF 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish what I regard as a most essential organization in the executive branch—an Antarctic Commission.

This Commission would be named "the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission," in honor of the great explorer whose name symbolizes man's search into the unknown, man's courage in the face of the elements, man's devotion to duty.

I introduce the bill, on behalf of myself and Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, CAPEHART, CASE of South Dakota, CHURCH, FLANDERS, GREEN, HENNINGSON, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, McCLELLAN, PAYNE, POTTER, REVERCOMB, SALTONSTALL, SMITH of Maine, SPARKMAN, and STENNIS.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is simple, and it is obvious. It is to establish a spearhead for a continuing Antarctic policy in the Government of the United States. I use each of these key words advisedly—"spearhead," "continuing," "policy."

SPEARHEAD

I use the word "spearhead" because a great many Government departments have now and will continue to have important responsibilities in the Antarctic field. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD a list of all of the Government agencies participating in or interested in our Antarctic program.

Some of these agencies have a direct, immediate, and broad-gaged interest, such as that of the Departments of Defense, State, Interior, and Commerce. The interest of other agencies is more limited. But all told, no less than 14 separate agencies do have an interest.

In the past have these 14 separate establishments been so completely effective as we might have hoped in developing our overall United States program in this vast region? With all due respect to the many expert Government servants who have worked devotedly on this subject, I believe that the answer is "No."

I believe that the record of the past speaks for itself—that we cannot expect 14 separate agencies, without overhead direction and coordination, to do the necessary well-rounded job for us.

"Everybody's business becomes nobody's business."

This is not the sort of situation which, in my judgment, the National Security Council can indefinitely allow to persist.

We must have an organized spearhead.

CONTINUOUS

I use the word "continuous" because the establishment of a commission is the key element which is absent from the present situation.

As I explained in my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 23, on pages 7499-7500, ours has tended to be an off-again, on-again, haphazard program in the Antarctic.

America's interest has been sporadic. We have sent expeditions, and those expeditions have been led and manned by great, gallant men. But thereafter, we have allowed the crews of the expeditions to be dispersed to many far different assignments, and the results of those expeditions have gathered dust in warehouses. Then, years later, we have become interested again, only thereafter once more to allow our interest to lapse. The result has been a scattered, uncoordinated, discontinuous approach. In effect, we have not done full justice to all the information compiled through the heroism, the patience, the persistence of the expeditions.

POLICY

Finally, I use the word "policy" because, in my judgment, and in the judgment of others who have worked on this Antarctic problem for a long time, we need to have a long-range national policy in the Antarctic. The time will come when we will stake out our own United States territorial claims in this area.

The time will come—must come—when we will decide how much of our physical resources—men, money, material—we will want to commit on a 5-year, 10-year, and longer basis in this area.

We cannot indefinitely postpone our decisions. We must have a national

policy, and it is only through a commission that we can establish such a policy. It is only through a commission that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States may assure themselves that we as a nation are fulfilling our responsibility.

THE UNKNOWN

Let us understand the awesome dimensions of this challenge.

The Antarctic, as my colleagues may be aware, covers an area of 6 million square miles. This is about the equivalent to the combined areas of the United States and of Europe. It is sheathed in perpetual ice and snow. It is the world's coldest region and the least known land area. A great many parts of the interior plateau, averaging around 6,000 feet above sea level, have never been explored.

We are only beginning to know the secrets of what minerals lie locked beneath the surface. We are only beginning to understand the weather of the Antarctic, and all the many other facets of it.

This is a great frontier—a frontier as challenging as any which has ever faced this or any other Nation. We must be adequate to the challenges of this frontier, as our ancestors were adequate to the call to the North American Continent, or the call to the West, the call to the Louisiana Purchase, the call to Alaska.

And not only our national interest is involved, but the interest of many nations—friends, neighbors, allies, and others.

APPENDED MATERIAL

I send to the desk an additional statement and appended materials, including the text of the bill itself. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, supplementary statement, and other matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2189) to promote the increase and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission Act of 1957.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act:

(1) "Commission" means the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

(2) "Director" means the Director of the Commission.

(3) "Council" means the Advisory Council.

(4) "Commissioned officer" means a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. There is established in the executive branch of the Government the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The Commission shall consist of a Director and two Deputy Directors.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall—

(1) maintain a depository of information relating to the Antarctic including: (A) all records of the Commission, (B) originals or copies of records within the executive branch relating to the Antarctic, (C) books, pamphlets, periodicals, and articles dealing with the Antarctic, and (D) such other information as the Commission considers desirable.

(2) conduct such field and laboratory studies and evaluations as it considers advisable to further the knowledge of the Antarctic.

(3) assist or advise in the establishment of territorial claims to the Antarctic by the United States.

(4) enter into contracts or agreements for the conduct of such research activity, investigation, or experimentation as the Commission considers essential to carry out the purposes of this act.

(5) perform, at the request of the head of any executive agency, specific research, investigation, or experimentation in connection with matters relating to the national defense or the interests of the United States.

(6) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and hold or dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real or personal property necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority under this act.

(7) receive and use funds donated to the Commission if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to carry out the general purposes of this act.

(8) publish or arrange for the publication of scientific, technical, historical, and general information so as to further the dissemination of information about the Antarctic, when the dissemination is consistent with the interests of national security and the public interest (publication may be made without regard to sec. 87 of the act of January 12, 1895, ch. 23 (28 Stat. 622), and sec. 11 of the act of March 1, 1919, ch. 86 (40 Stat. 1270, 44 U. S. C. 111));

(9) approve the plans for and supervise Antarctic operations or expeditions conducted by, or supported by, other agencies of the United States except for operations or expeditions or parts thereof which are military in character;

(10) assist private Antarctic expeditions or research programs when such assistance is in the best interests of the United States;

(11) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946, chapter 744 (60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for persons serving without compensation;

(12) report to the President before September 16 of each year, summarizing the activities of the Commission and making such recommendations as it considers appropriate. The report shall include the recommendation of the Council and any minority views of the members of the Council.

THE DIRECTOR OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of 6 years and shall be paid at the rate prescribed in section 107 (a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 736). He may be a person appointed from civilian life or a commissioned officer in an active or retired status.

(b) The Director shall—

(1) manage the affairs of the Commission;

(2) issue such regulations as he considers necessary to carry out this act; and

(3) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out this act.

(c) The appointments made and the compensation fixed shall be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and the regu-

lations of the Civil Service Commission. However, the Director may employ such technical and professional personnel, and fix their compensation, as he considers necessary, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 or the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The Director may terminate the employment of any officers or employees, including the Deputy Directors, whenever he considers that termination to be in the best interests of the United States, except that no person in the classified service may be removed or suspended without pay unless it is accomplished under the act of August 24, 1912, chapter 389 (37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U. S. C. 652).

DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 6. (a) The Deputy Directors shall be appointed by the Director and shall perform such duties as he may prescribe.

(b) The Deputy Directors may be appointed from civilian life or may be commissioned officers in an active or retired status. However, if the Director is appointed from civilian life, only one Deputy Director may be a commissioned officer. If the Director is a commissioned officer, both Deputy Directors shall be appointed from civilian life.

(c) The Deputy Directors shall be paid \$15,000 a year.

MILITARY STATUS OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. (a) When a commissioned officer is appointed as Director or Deputy Director, he is not subject to military authority and may not exercise command over any members of the Armed Forces of the United States except as the President may prescribe.

(b) The appointment of a commissioned officer as Director or Deputy Director does not affect his status or rank or the pay and allowances incident to his status or rank. He is entitled to receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer of his rank and length of service, for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Commission. He is also entitled to be paid by the Commission the amount by which the compensation provided for the Director or Deputy Director exceeds his annual military pay and allowances.

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 8. (a) The Advisory Council, consisting of 12 members, shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Council must be persons who are eminently qualified in their professions. So far as practicable, the members shall be chosen from various fields of endeavor so as to provide a broad field of knowledge and experience which will properly relate the activities of the Commission to the national welfare. However, the majority of the Council must be persons eminently qualified in the knowledge of the basic sciences pertaining to the Antarctic.

(b) The members of the Council shall be appointed for a period of 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of the term; (2) the term of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 4 at the end of 2 years, 4 at the end of 4 years, and 4 at the end of 6 years; and (3) a member may be reappointed to the Council for not more than one additional term.

(c) The members of the Council shall be paid at the rate of \$50 per day for each day they serve performing the functions of the Council, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946, chapter 744 (60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b-2).

(d) The Council shall—

(1) meet annually on the first Monday in November and at such other times as the Chairman determines;

(2) elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, at the regular annual meeting, to serve for the following year;

(3) review and assess the research and exploration activities relating to the Antarctic; and

(4) make such recommendations to the Commission as they consider appropriate for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge of the Antarctic.

SERVICES AND FUNDS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States. However, such services and facilities may be furnished only if it does not interfere with the performance of the primary mission of the agency concerned. An agency having custody of data relating to the matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission shall, upon request of the Director, make that data available to the Commission without reimbursement.

(b) Funds available to any agency of the United States for scientific or technical research, educational, or other public service are available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency concerned, to the Commission for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which those funds were provided. Funds so transferred shall be spent by the Commission for the purposes for which the transfer was made or for general administrative expenses until such time as an appropriation is made available to the Commission.

ACTS AMENDED

SEC. 10. Subsection 107 (a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended by adding the following after clause (22):

"(23) Director of the Antarctic Commission."

SEC. 11. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 762; 5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(f) The Director of the Antarctic Commission is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of seven positions in the Antarctic Commission in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

The supplementary statement and other matters presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY TRIBUTE

In introducing this bill today, I want to pay tribute to those who have worked long and hard toward the introduction and enactment of such a bill.

Greatest credit of all goes to Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd himself, who, without expectation of this recognition, had done so much and so well, prior to his untimely passing.

But, then, there are others of his coworkers who deserve much credit for carrying on in the Byrd tradition.

I want to pay tribute to Adm. George Dufek, Admiral Byrd's worthy successor, and to Dr. James Mooney, officer in charge of the Navy's Antarctic program.

And there are great numbers of my colleagues on both sides of the Hill who have likewise been interested in this subject.

I should like, in particular, to single out the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the able senior

Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Earlier this year, my colleague sent to the State Department an inquiry asking the Department to comment as regards United States policy on the Antarctic.

I may say that this well-deserved inquiry follows up on previous inquiries which were sent by predecessor chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including the former senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally].

Time does not permit me to list all of the other many Senators who have been interested in this subject. But I should like in passing to refer, if only briefly, to our associates from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

And, of course, I need hardly state in detail the deep interest in this subject which I know is felt by one of the great lights in the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who while he is not a cosponsor of this particular bill, is nonetheless a most thoughtful observer of this entire subject.

I should also like to pay tribute to the interest which has been shown by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, our colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE].

TIME

We, the Senate cosponsors, realize, of course, that the hour is relatively late in this first session of the 85th Congress.

It will take time for the executive branch agencies to complete their study of this subject.

But it is my hope that in the not too distant future, hearings will be held on this legislation. And it is my hope that thereafter we will act to establish this Commission.

NEED FOR COORDINATION

I may say that I, for one, would ordinarily be skeptical of establishing still another instrumentality in the executive branch, since obviously there are far too many independent groups in that branch. And the whole trend of the Hoover Commission and of other studies has been toward consolidating such groups.

Nevertheless, we have learned that when there is a great need it cannot be fulfilled by a scattered, uncoordinated approach.

BILL OUR OWN

I should like to emphasize that this bill is introduced only on behalf of the Senators mentioned and myself. The bill represents the best thinking, the best judgment of drafting experts and Antarctic experts which could be mobilized on our request.

The bill is, however, our own. We will be looking forward to the results of the administration's further review of this subject with deep interest.

PROTECT OUR RIGHTS

I should like to state very clearly that one of my deep concerns with respect to the Antarctic is to make sure that the United States is fully protected as regards the claims which she will ultimately make as regards title to territory in the Antarctic.

In this connection, I have been studying with interest the law of nations bearing upon possession of territory in Antarctica.

There are a host of complex legal questions which arise in this connection. I have set out some of these questions in a memorandum which will follow these remarks.

In this connection, however, I invite attention to observations on the legal problems of title to polar and subpolar regions in the book *Digest of International Law*, by Green Hayward Hackworth, former legal adviser of the Department of State, volume I, as published by the Government Printing Office in 1940.

The references beginning on page 449 reflect the historic United States positions in

this connection, but also reflect the myriad of problems which have arisen, and which we may expect to arise in the future, so far as territorial claims by the various nations are concerned.

THE FUTURE

Naturally, I am deeply interested in making sure that future generations will say of us that "they in 1957 did not forget the future needs of the American flag in the polar regions."

And while I am naturally desirous of protecting the rights of our flag, I am likewise desirous of promoting sound international relations.

The history of man's exploration of the polar unknown reflects many inspiring chapters of the cooperation of individuals of many nationalities.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

At this very moment, the scientists of many nations contributing to the International Geophysical Year are writing a further story in splendid international cooperation.

It is so difficult to combat the elements in this area that it is obviously essential that there be such full cooperation by the scientists and explorers now at work in all parts of Antarctica.

GREETINGS TO ANTARCTICA

In introducing this legislation today, I would like to say a word of greeting to all of the men who are now manning the United States stations in Antarctica, to the men at Little America—at Byrd, Pole, Weddell, Knox, Adare, Williams Air Operations Facility Stations.

It has been my pleasure to hear from several of these men through the courtesy of shortwave operators. And I may say it gives one a real thrill to think of these modern-day Vikings serving the American flag. They are continuing a tradition, as courageous, as dedicated, as that recorded in any previous chapter of American history.

I am particularly proud that we have a very sizable contingent of Wisconsin men at these various stations. But whatever their State, indeed, whatever the land in which they or their forefathers were born, they are Americans all, and I am very proud of them.

The best tribute which we in the Congress can pay to these men is through enactment of legislation of this nature.

These are men who are willing to risk their all. Surely, the very least that we can do is to provide the top-side organization through which they will be most effective.

HONOR TO NAVY

I know that these men are proud to work with and in their respective agencies of the Government, especially, of course, the men who wear the proud uniform of Navy blue and gold. But through the proposed Antarctic Commission, the Navy (which has performed so splendidly in conditions of adversity in the Antarctic, as it always has elsewhere as well) will be in a still stronger position to serve this great objective. And so will the other agencies of Government.

I may say that the United States Government is the only one of the major powers in the world which lacks such a coordinating body as the Commission.

SPEED UNITED STATES PROGRESS

Yet, we are the great hope of the Free World for the speeding up of progress in the Antarctic. We alone, in the Free World, have the resources. It is our national interest which is at stake even more than that of the powers which are closely adjacent to the area, because it is the United States which is the leader of the free nations of the world.

Let us not delay in fulfilling our responsibility.

Let us not allow another year to pass, another 5 years, or 10 years, before we awaken

as Dick Byrd implored us to awaken, to the challenges of this frontier.

Let us enact this bill, a bill which I humbly believe may prove to be one of the great landmarks of the 85th Congress.

FIVE APPENDED MATERIALS

There follow now the materials to which I have earlier referred, as well as other items.

The first item is a list of all of the United States Government agencies and bureaus of such agencies participating in or interested in the Antarctic.

The second is a list of the principal government-sponsored polar organizations of the foreign powers.

This list includes the organizations in all nations which have announced claims to territory in Antarctica.

It will be noted that with the possible exception of Chile, all the polar organizations listed are either autonomous units or quasi-governmental in character. Their missions vary, but all have a responsibility for maintaining their respective nation's interests in the Antarctic through, in part, the dissemination to the public of up-to-date information.

The third item is a chronology of United States activities in the Antarctic.

I may say that I am grateful to the Department of the Navy for furnishing me the factual material of the above three memoranda.

While, as I have indicated, neither the Department of the Navy nor the Department of Defense as a whole is responsible for this legislation, they have been most gracious and cooperative in fulfilling my requests for information.

And, finally, I should like to include the legal memorandum of my own—posing a few of the many problems which arise in connection with territorial claims in the Antarctic.

While these materials are of rather extended length, I believe that they are necessary to provide a satisfactory degree of understanding of this problem.

I may say that it is my intention to comment further in the Senate on this subject.

LIST OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN OR INTERESTED IN THE ANTARCTIC

1. Department of Defense: Joint Chiefs of Staff, Office of Special Operations.

(a) Department of the Navy: (1) Task Force 43, (2) Office of Naval Research, (3) Hydrographic Office, (4) Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, (5) Bureau of Aeronautics, (6) Bureau of Yards and Docks, (7) Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

(b) Department of the Army: (1) Office of Chief of Staff for Research and Development, (2) Corps of Engineers (SIPRE), (3) Signal Corps.

(c) Department of the Air Force: (1) Director of Research and Development, (2) Air Force Cambridge Research Center, (3) Arctic, Desert, Tropic Information Center.

2. Department of State.

3. Department of the Interior: (a) United States Geological Survey, (b) United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

4. Department of Commerce: (a) National Bureau of Standards, (b) United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, (c) United States Weather Bureau.

5. National Science Foundation: Office for International Geophysical Year.

6. United States National Academy of Science.

7. Central Intelligence Agency.

8. Atomic Energy Commission.

9. Office of Defense Mobilization.

10. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: (a) Food and Drug Administration, (b) National Institutes of Health.

11. National Archives.

12. Library of Congress.

13. Smithsonian Institution: (a) United States National Museum, (b) National Zoological Park.

14. United States Board on Geographic Names.

FOREIGN POLAR ORGANIZATIONS

Country: Argentina.

Title: Instituto Antartico Argentino.

Established: 1951.

Financing: Governmental.

Mission: To develop programs and provide support for scientific activities in the Antarctic, maintain collections and laboratories for research purposes, issue publications, encourage research, and stimulate public interest in Antarctic.

Remarks: The Argentine Antarctic Institute is organized as an autonomous unit with separate budget under the Ministry of Marine. Logistic support for Argentine Antarctic expeditions is provided largely by the Argentine Navy.

Country: Australia.

Title: Antarctic Division of the Department of External Affairs.

Established: 1948.

Financing: Governmental.

Mission: To direct the operations of the Australian National Antarctic Research Expedition and advise the Commonwealth Government upon all matters pertaining to Australian interests in the Antarctic.

Functions: Plans, finances, and directs logistic and scientific activities, maintains a library and archives, issues publications, and advises the Government.

Remarks: The Antarctic Division is both an operating and research agency lodged within the Australian equivalent of the State Department.

Country: Chile.

Title: Antarctic Department, Ministry of Exterior Relations Antarctic Department, General Staff of the Armed Forces.

Financing: Governmental.

Missions: The Antarctic Department, Ministry of Exterior Relations, plans the Chilean scientific problems. The Antarctic Department, General Staff of the Armed Forces, plans expeditions and provides logistic support.

Country: Denmark.

Title: Arktisk Institute.

Established: 1954.

Financing: Governmental.

Mission: To promote Arctic research, disseminate knowledge of the Arctic regions, and to maintain contact between Denmark and foreign countries in all fields connected with the Arctic.

Remarks: The Arktisk Institute has a six-man governing board which is assisted by a council of scientists and other prominent persons with day-by-day administration in the hands of a permanent official with the title of secretary.

Country: France.

Title: Expéditions Polaires Françaises: Missions Paul-Emile Victor.

Established: 1947.

Financing: Governmental and private.

Mission: To plan, support, and direct French expeditions to both the Arctic and Antarctic regions, collect and publish the results of such expeditions, and maintain archives and library for purposes of information and research.

Remarks: The Expéditions Polaires Françaises is an autonomous agency benefiting from State subsidies and subject to administrative and fiscal review by the Ministries of National Education and Finance. It is headed by a director, assisted by a management committee for administrative matters and a scientific commission which develops plans for research, reviews the results, and provides for publication.

Country: New Zealand.

Title: New Zealand Antarctic Society.

Established: 1933; suspended during World War II, revived 1949.

Financing: Private.

Mission: To collect and disseminate scientific and other information relating to the Antarctic, stimulate interest in the area, and assist explorers both New Zealand and foreign.

Remarks: New Zealand has no central governmental organization for the coordination of Antarctic affairs. The International Geophysical Year effort is being directed by a national committee. The New Zealand part of the British and Commonwealth trans-Antarctic expedition comes under the direction of a recently established Ross Sea committee. The ministry of external affairs has an Antarctic division, as have other interested ministries. Members of the New Zealand Antarctic Society participate in many of these governmental organizations.

Country: Norway.

Title: Norsk Polarinstitutt.

Established: 1948.

Financing: Governmental.

Mission: To plan and direct polar expeditions, compile results, issue publications, and maintain liaison with foreign polar organizations.

Remarks: Organized as an independent agency under the Ministry of Handicraft and Labor. It has a director and six divisions.

Country: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Title: The Arctic Institute of the Soviet Union.

Established: 1930.

Financing: Governmental.

Mission: To direct scientific expeditions, conduct research, provide meteorological and other services, issue publications, and maintain a museum.

Remarks: With headquarters in Leningrad, the Arctic Institute maintains laboratories and field stations. It is part of the chief administration of the northern sea route, and its headquarters staff alone employs over 500 scientists and technical personnel. Its exact relation to the present Soviet effort in the Antarctic is not clear, but from it have been drawn the techniques, equipment, and trained personnel now in the area. Logistic support is provided in the Antarctic by the ships of the Northern Sea Route Administration. The present Antarctic expedition is under the All-Union Academy of Sciences, operating through a subordinate Antarctic Commission.

Country: United Kingdom.

Title: Scott Polar Research Institute.

Established: 1926.

Financing: Governmental and private.

Mission: To serve as a center for the collection of polar records and equipment provide expert advice on techniques of polar exploration, and provide research facilities for working up the scientific results of polar expeditions.

Remarks: The Scott Polar Research Institute started as a private organization with a small endowment. Since World War II, it has received grants from the Governments of the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Falkland Islands. These grants currently account for four-fifths of the institute's income. It is organized as part of the geography department of Cambridge University with its own director and management committee. Not officially a part of the Government, the institute maintains close relations with the foreign office, colonial office, and other Government departments, partly through interlocking personnel.

CHRONOLOGY OF UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES IN THE ANTARCTIC

1790-1830: Heyday of Antarctic sealing. Based on Cook's 1772-75 reports of seals in the area, many voyages were made. In 1791, 102 vessels are known to have engaged in sealing in southern waters. During the 1820-21 season, 44 vessels were in the South Shetlands alone. The great majority of the sealers were American or British, but other

nations participated. Because sealers sought to keep secret the location of good hunting grounds, relatively little is known of these voyages. A few, of which the surviving records are extant and which have historical importance, are noted below. By 1830, the fur sealers were nearly extinct.

1819-20: J. P. Sheffield, a sealer, operated in South Shetlands.

1820-21: Numerous sealers operated around South Shetland Islands. N. B. Palmer on November 17, 1820, believed to have sighted Antarctica, south of Deception Island; Capt. John Davis on February 7, 1821, made first known landing on continent at Hughes Bay; Capt. Robert Johnson reported as reaching 66° south, 70° west.

1821-22: United States sealers, seeking seal beaches, visited islands and parts of Palmer Peninsula. N. B. Palmer accompanied by Englishman, George Powell, discovered South Orkneys in December 1821.

1822-23: Capt. Ben Morrell visited Bouvet, South Sandwich Islands, and possibly Weddell Sea.

1829-31: Capt. Ben Pendleton, first United States expedition to carry scientists, reached 62° south, 103° west.

1838-42: Lt. Charles Wilkes, United States Navy, with six ships, made first United States Government-sponsored expedition; in February 1839 visited South Shetlands and Louis Philippe Peninsula; penetrated pack off Thurston Peninsula; between December 1839 and February 1840, explored from about 160° east to 98° east, making numerous sightings and establishing fact that Antarctica was a continent.

1853-54: Capt. John Heard discovered Heard Island; during following years United States sealers were active in this vicinity, including wintering-over parties.

1928-30: Wilkins-Hearst expedition, largely financed by United States citizens and organizations, under Sir Hubert Wilkins; first airplane flight over Antarctica, in Palmer Peninsula area, November 26, 1928, with C. B. Eielson, a United States citizen, as pilot.

1928-31: Byrd Antarctic expedition, privately financed, under Rear Adm. R. E. Byrd, United States Navy, wintered at Little America I, Bay of Whales; discovered Rockefeller Mountains, Edsel Ford Mountains, and Marie Byrd Land; geological survey in Queen Maud Range; made first flight over the South Pole, November 29, 1929.

1933-34: First Lincoln Ellsworth expedition, visited Bay of Whales, January 1934.

1933-35: Second Byrd Antarctic expedition, privately financed, under Rear Adm. R. E. Byrd, United States Navy; wintered at Little America II, Bay of Whales; extensive use of aircraft, tractors, and other modern equipment; notable for the extent of scientific work, particularly in area east of the Ross Sea; an advanced weather station about 90 miles from the sea was manned for 7 months, much of the time by Admiral Byrd alone.

1934-35: Second Ellsworth expedition, based at Snow Hill Island; projected flight across Antarctica thwarted by bad weather.

1935-36: Third Ellsworth expedition, based at Dundee Island; November 21-December 5, trans-Antarctic flight from Dundee Island to vicinity of Bay of Whales; discovered Ellsworth Highland.

1938-39: Fourth Ellsworth expedition, discovered American Highland.

1939-41: United States Antarctic service expedition, officially sponsored, under Rear Adm. R. E. Byrd; established west base at Little America III, under Dr. Paul A. Siple, and east base on Stonington Island, Marguerite Bay, under Lt. Comdr. R. B. Black, United States Naval Reserve; extensive exploratory and scientific work carried on in southern part of Palmer Peninsula and in area east of Ross Sea.

1946-47: Operation Highjump, with Rear Adm. R. E. Byrd as officer in charge, and Rear

Adm. R. H. Cruzen as commander, Task Force 68. Largest expedition ever sent to Antarctic, divided into three groups. Central group established Little America IV at Bay of Whales; 6 transport planes flown from an aircraft carrier to Little America IV to carry out 29 photo flights; eastern group photographed coast from 100° west to 125° west, and then eastward as far as Princess Martha Coast; western group photographed coast from 164° east to 15° east.

1947-48: Ronne Antarctic research expedition, with official and private sponsorship under Comdr. Finn Ronne, reoccupied east base of United States Antarctic service expedition; extensive sledge and aerial exploration and photographing; cooperated with Falkland Islands Dependencies Survey.

1947-48: United States Navy Operation Windmill, two icebreakers, under Comdr. G. L. Ketchum, cruised from 92° east to Marguerite Bay, making numerous landings en route, extensive use of helicopters.

1954-55: U. S. S. *Atka*, under command of Comdr. Glen Jacobsen, departed Boston on December 1, 1954; arrived Bay of Whales, January 1955; continued eastward as far as Cape Norvegia on a reconnaissance for station sites for the International Geophysical Year.

1955-56: Operation Deep Freeze with Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd as officer in charge, United States Antarctic programs, and Rear Adm. George J. Dufek as commander, United States Naval Support Force, Antarctic, established naval air facility at McMurdo Sound, and Little America V at Kainan Bay; aircraft flights surveyed and photographed large areas of central ice dome, and one flight crossed from the Ross Sea to the Weddell Sea and return via the South Pole.

1956-57: Operation Deep Freeze II completed preparation for the International Geophysical Year by establishment of scientific stations along the coast at Cape Adare, Vincennes Bay, Gould Bay, and in the interior in the center of Marie Byrd Land and at the South Pole itself.

SOME INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT LEGAL ASPECTS OF ANTARCTIC EXPLORATION

The question may well be asked: Notwithstanding these or any other responsibilities, have our Departments of State and of Justice been giving adequate thought to the many territorial and legal questions which further exploration and/or use of the Antarctic will pose? Are they thinking in the 20th century toward the 21st century? Or are their thoughts back in terms of 19th-century legal standards?

What are a few of the points which might arise? Consider these questions: Does an act of discovery give a nation a right of possession? If so, under what circumstances?

How must that right be preserved and confirmed?

What is the relation of the doctrine of the freedom of the seas to the polar icecap floating on the sea beneath?

Should the large areas of ice which are permanently there be considered subject to the possession of any nation, since they can be inhabited and scientific stations of importance may be placed on them? Does not the increasing importance of the North Pole to aviation tend to affect this question? Or is the old assumption still acceptable that "a moving and shifting substance like the North Polar Sea ice" is within the freedom of the seas? Can the idea of a fixed boundary of a nation be adapted to a shifting surface, where there is always ice, but not always the same ice?

Then, shifting one's thought to the South Pole, is the resting of some ice on, or attachment of the shelf-ice area, at least partially, to solid ground enough to differentiate it from the icecap at the North Pole, legally speaking?

On the whole, should the same legal principles apply to that part of the Antarctic ice barrier which is afloat, as to the part which rests on solid ground? (All of it can apparently be used much as ice on land could. Almost none of it can be navigated as the open seas can.)

Must any rights gained by discovery or exploration be followed by occupation and settlement? If so, how soon must this occur? And how extensive and how dense must the settlement be?

Should the "rigor of climatic conditions in the polar regions" relax any requirement of territorial occupation? If so, must the nations exercise effective control over the area? Would control of the air above be sufficient?

If the Antarctic is not the possession of any sovereign state, how will sovereignty be exercised there? What law will apply and how will it be enforced?

If someone were murdered there, how would he be tried? Could one apply the law of the nations which sent out the expedition, an analogy to the law's following the flag on a seagoing vessel?

How can such questions be peaceably decided?

What tribunal would determine any conflicting claims?

How would title be enforced? How and with whom would title be recorded?

There follow some pertinent quotations concerning the international law of acquiring sovereignty over discovered territory by occupation. They are quoted from Oppenheim's standard treatise on international law, volume I, entitled "Peace," pages 506-514:

"Occupation is the act of appropriation by a state through which it intentionally acquires sovereignty over such territory as is at the time not under the sovereignty of another state.

"And it must be emphasized that occupation can only take place by and for a state; it must be a state act, that is, it must be performed in the service of a state, or it must be acknowledged by a state after its performance.

"Only such territory can be the object of occupation as is no State's land, whether entirely uninhabited, for instance, an island, or inhabited by natives whose community is not to be considered as a state.

"On the other hand, a territory which once belonged to a state, but has been afterward abandoned, is a possible object for occupation by another state.

"Theory and practice agree nowadays upon the rule that occupation is effected through taking possession of, and establishing an administration over, the territory in the name of, and for, the acquiring state.

"Possession: The territory must really be taken into possession by the occupying state. For this purpose it is necessary that it should take the territory under its sway (corpus) with the intention of acquiring sovereignty over it (animus). This can only be done by a settlement on the territory, accompanied by some formal act which announces both that the territory has been taken possession of and that the possessor intends to keep it under his sovereignty. It usually consists either of a proclamation or of the hoisting of a flag. But such formal act by itself constitutes fictitious occupation only, unless there is left on the territory a settlement which is able to keep up the authority of the flag.

"Administration: After having, in the aforementioned way, taken possession of a territory, the possessor must establish some kind of administration thereon which shows that the territory is really governed by the new possessor. If, within a reasonable time after the act of taking possession, the possessor does not establish some responsible authority which exercises governing functions, there is then no effective occupation,

since in fact no sovereignty is exercised by any state over the territory.

"However, it was not until the 18th century that the writers on the law of nations postulated an effective occupation, or until the 19th century that the practice of the states accorded with this postulate. But although nowadays discovery does not constitute acquisition through occupation, it is nevertheless not without importance. It is agreed that discovery gives to the state in whose service it was made an inchoate title; it acts as a temporary bar to occupation by another state for such a period as is reasonably sufficient for effectively occupying the discovered territory. If the period lapses without any attempt by the discovering state to turn its inchoate title into a real title of occupation, the inchoate title perishes, and any other state can now acquire the territory by means of an effective occupation.

"Finally, in determining the degree of effectiveness of occupation necessary to confer sovereignty, regard must be had to the extent of competing claims of other states. Thus in the dispute between Denmark and Norway concerning the status of eastern Greenland, decided by the permanent Court of International Justice on April 5, 1933, the Court attached considerable importance to the fact that up to 1931 there had been no claim by any power other than Denmark to sovereignty over Greenland."

It seems to me that more intensive and continuous thought should be given by the United States Government to the title to the Antarctic, or as to what action, if any, should be taken to confirm our rights.

A good start in such thinking was made in 1933 by that able and well-known assistant legal adviser to the Department of State, the Honorable William R. Vallance.

There should be more analysis like his article entitled "Title to Land in Antarctica," which appeared in the October 1933 issue of the Federal Bar Association Journal, beginning at page 53.

WAIVING OF LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Memorial Day in Minneapolis, Minn., was marred by a very tragic accident yesterday morning, when a fine young Navy officer died and four residents of the city of Minneapolis were seriously injured, and others were less seriously injured, in the crash of a naval aircraft in north Minneapolis following a ceremonial formation flyover for the Memorial Day service. I may add that there was also considerable property damage.

I believe that the practice of flying these nontraining flights should be severely restricted, both for the safety of the pilots and for the safety of the civilian population, for the usual practice in these cases is to schedule a formation flight at the lowest permissible altitude.

Therefore, I have written today to the Secretary of the Navy and to the Secretary of Defense, requesting that a policy directive be issued banning such low altitude close-formation ceremonial flights, and generally restricting all military flights to those with a legitimate training purpose.

In the case of the collision and crash yesterday, which, by the way, was one of a series of 3 or 4 such accidents in the past year in Minneapolis, the tragedy which occurred might have been compounded to shocking proportions if one

of the planes which crashed in an unoccupied space had hit a nearby playground crowded with children, which was a very short distance away.

As it is, more than a dozen citizens of Minneapolis were injured, four of them very seriously, and, as I have indicated, there was extensive property damage to several residences.

The Federal Government should prepare, I strongly feel, to recompense the victims of this tragedy at the earliest possible moment, without the necessity of taking the matter into the courts. For this reason, I have prepared proposed legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy, upon the presentation of just claims in this matter, to pay amounts in excess of \$1,000.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is traditional in the Senate. I prepared similar legislation about 7 months ago in regard to another crash which occurred at the naval airbase, Wold Chamberlain Airport.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to fulfill these objectives. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2190) to waive the \$1,000 limitation on the authority of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the settlement and payment of claims arising out of the crash of a United States Navy airplane at Minneapolis, Minn., on May 30, 1957, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the \$1,000 limitation contained in the first section of the act of July 3, 1943, as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Navy airplane in the 1900 block of Pierce Street NE, Minneapolis, Minn., on May 30, 1957.

SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of the airplane crash described in the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall, within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this act, transmit to the Congress a report setting forth—

(1) each claim settled and paid by the Secretary of the Navy, with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

(2) each claim submitted which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claim.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letters to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1957.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know an unfortunate crash of two Navy jet aircraft over

Minneapolis yesterday has resulted in the death of 1 pilot, Comdr. Newell Olson, USNR, and the serious injury of 4 civilians. It is my understanding that this flight was undertaken as a ceremonial flight during Memorial Day exercises.

In the attached letter to the Secretary of the Navy, I have urged that a policy directive be issued forbidding such tight formation ceremonial flights made at altitudes below 5,000 feet.

I urge that this policy be considered at the Defense Department level, to apply equally to all air components of the Defense Department.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MAY 31, 1957.

The Honorable THOMAS S. GATES, JR.,
Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reference to my telegram of May 30 regarding the unfortunate crash of two Navy jet aircraft in North Minneapolis, I wish to urge immediate consideration of a policy directive which would forbid the kind of ceremonial flights that resulted in the loss of Comdr. Newell Olson, USNR, and the serious injury of four civilians yesterday.

I do not feel that pilots should be called upon to make the kind of low-altitude, tight formation flights which are hazardous both to themselves and the general public below. I regret the loss of Commander Olson. He was a fine officer.

A uniform policy throughout the Defense Department forbidding tight formation ceremonial flights at altitudes of less than 5,000 feet would seem a desirable achievement.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, along with a telegram which I received yesterday from the mayor of Minneapolis, Hon. Eric G. Hoyer, printed in the RECORD, along with copies of telegrams I have sent.

There being no objection, the letter and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1957.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed
Services Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reference to my telegram to you on May 30, I wish to bring to your attention the attached letters which I have directed to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense regarding the crash of 2 Navy jet aircraft in Minneapolis yesterday, and urging that a new policy directive be issued for all air components of the Defense Department to forbid all such ceremonial flights by military aircraft as resulted in the death of 1 pilot and the serious injury of 4 civilians.

I respectfully request that the committee discuss this matter with the Defense Department to the end that serious consideration will be given to this proposal.

Frankly, I do not feel that these pilots in the armed services, who lead a hazardous enough life as it is, should be called on to fly tight-formation flights which are not for a training purpose. Of course, flying at low altitudes over heavily populated areas is simply asking for trouble.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Regard tragic, airplane crash northeast Minneapolis this morning in which two Panther jets collided in midair, crashing, killing one pilot, and resulting in injuries to an undetermined number of civilians. It was my understanding that an agreement had been made that no jet operations would be made from Wold Chamberlain Airport and no jet flights would be made over the city of Minneapolis except for interceptor purposes. Was this agreement in effect at this time? If not why not demand immediate Congressional investigation to affix responsibility demand that jet operations cease immediately except for such interceptor purposes as are necessary.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor of City of Minneapolis.

MAY 30, 1957.

Hon. ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor, City of Minneapolis, Minn.:

Reurtel have requested Secretary of Navy Gates to initiate immediate investigation. Have also asked chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, RICHARD RUSSELL, to begin investigation.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building:

Urge immediate inquiry into new naval jet air crash tragedy involving civilians and civilian homes in Minneapolis today. Want to talk with you Friday about this situation.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.:

Request an immediate investigation crash of two naval jet aircraft this morning in north Minneapolis, Minn.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BRIDGES, ANDERSON, PURTELL, GORE, THYE, KENNEDY, and GOLDWATER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. This bill is to amend the lobbying statutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2191) to amend title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL CENTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that consent has been given for the introduction of bills today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. There is a bill I should like to introduce on behalf of my great

friend and colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. I will supply the desk with a copy of the bill in a few minutes. I introduce the bill now, and ask to have it appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2194) to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Hospital Center and facilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for Mr. NEELY and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN FEDERAL EXCISE TAX LAWS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIBLE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7125) to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

Address entitled "Approval of Atomic Agency Essential to United States Leadership," delivered by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE to New Jersey Young Republicans at Atlantic City, N. J., and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1957.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address delivered by him on May 24, 1957, at Adas Israel Synagogue, Washington, D. C., at services honoring Jewish war veterans of the United States.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jack Chapler Brown, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, for a term of 4 years. Reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 7, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

AID TO SPAIN AND GREECE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to report to the Senate this

afternoon, with regard to some recommendations which were made following a trip I made to Spain and Greece and other areas, that the Department of State has taken some action which I felt was urgently needed and overdue.

I was informed on Wednesday afternoon late that both Secretary Benson and Secretary Dulles have wired the American Ambassador at Madrid, Spain, the Honorable John Lodge, to enter into proper negotiations or to draw up the necessary agreements for the sale of 70,000 tons of wheat under Public Law 480. It is a matter of record. I was very much disturbed over the previous failure to conclude this arrangement. The Spanish people are on the verge of bread rationing. The political situation is very difficult, as is the economic situation. It is gratifying to know that action has been taken. In my visit with the Secretary of State last Sunday afternoon, I urged that this action be taken at once, before time had run out.

I am also pleased to note for the RECORD, as a result of the recommendation made from Greece, that the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture have worked together on ordering the release of local currencies generated under Public Law 480 and in the hands of the International Cooperation Administration in Greece. These funds are for economic development. They are loans by our Government of the local currency which we received from the sale of foodstuffs in Greece. For almost a year these funds have been impounded. There has been no use made of them, even though the Greeks had been led to believe an agreement had been arrived at.

I am pleased to note that when Dr. Butz, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, was in Greece—and I think he arrived 2 days after I left—he, too, made this recommendation. As a result of these recommendations, the Department has reconsidered and action has taken place.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] advised the Senate that the Department of Agriculture had agreed to sell 70,000 tons of wheat to Spain. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his diligent efforts in securing the approval of the Department for this sale. I think it will be helpful, not only in furnishing food to a country which urgently needs it, but also because it will create good will which will benefit the United States in that section of the world.

I myself did not have an opportunity to take part in the transaction, but I know some of the problems in connection with it. I may say that I think it was an excellent piece of work on the part of the Senator from Minnesota. I think that if the United States will sell wheat to Spain, Israel, and Greece, and will accept their currencies in payment, we will be rendering a real service, not only to our own Nation, but also to the countries involved.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND FACULTY OF KENSINGTON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, KENSINGTON, MD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I notice the gallery is filled with a number of young people today from many schools throughout our land. In the gallery happens to be one of my sons, who is a freshman, a ninth-grader in the junior high school of Kensington, Md. I know he will be angry with his Dad for mentioning this, but a number of the students are here. We had lunch together, and we are going to have the afternoon together.

I wish to note for the RECORD that some of the students of this fine junior high school of Kensington, Md., along with faculty members, and mothers, including Mrs. Humphrey, are in the gallery, visiting the Senate. [Applause.]

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS (S. REPT. NO. 395)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 29, 1957, the following report of a committee was submitted:

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, created by Senate Resolution 219 of the 84th Congress, as extended by Senate Resolutions 47 and 128 of the 85th Congress, I ask unanimous consent to file the final report of the committee, including individual views of certain Senators.

The committee was created in February 1956. The life of the committee was extended from January 31, 1957, to May 31, 1957. The committee has spent \$163,271.26, or less than one-half of the \$350,000 appropriated, returning \$186,728.74 to the Treasury.

It will be recalled that the creation of the committee was prompted in part by the so-called Neff-Patman incident which was promptly investigated by another committee. Despite intense efforts to secure leads on other acts of illegalities or improprieties, if any, our committee was not apprised of any such episodes and discovered none by independent investigation.

The question whether attempts to influence any Member of the Senate improperly or illegally is one that could best be answered by the Senators themselves. As I previously reported to the Senate, our committee invited and requested each Senator to supply the committee with any knowledge or information on the subject. Of the 43 Senators who replied, only 3 or 4 reported or suggested any facts or information on the subject.

In view of the expressions of the President in vetoing the Harris-Fulbright bill, regarding questionable activities in connection with that bill, an invitation was also extended to the President, the Director of the Budget, and the Attorney General for any facts or information in their possession concerning the subjects under the committee's jurisdiction. No

evidence or information was furnished to the committee from these sources.

An invitation was thereafter extended to include members of the press and the public to furnish any facts or information to the committee on subjects under its jurisdiction.

As stated in the report, facts or information furnished to the committee under these invitations and appeals, were negligible. The committee promptly instituted an independent investigation of its own on all aspects of its commitments under the authorizing resolution.

The report being filed today is the culmination and result of a broad investigation and study of the matters under the committee's jurisdiction.

The committee is confident that the report contains many constructive suggestions and is a valuable contribution to the subject matter for consideration by legislative committees in the future. The report is an extensive one. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the statement the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I tendered to the press with respect to the subject matter, which briefly summarizes important phases of the report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATORS JOHN L. McCLELLAN, CHAIRMAN, AND STYLES BRIDGES, VICE CHAIRMAN

The final report of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions is divided into two general subjects: (1) lobbying, and (2) campaign financing.

As to lobbying, the report is unanimous. As to campaign financing, the report is unanimous on many phases and also contains the separate views of several members with respect to other points on which unanimity was not reached.

The work of the special committee may be described generally as (1) investigatory, and (2) a study for the purpose of making legislative recommendations. The report deals with the few specific complaints received by the committee and shows also, among other things, the varied nature of legislative activities, running the gamut from activities of so-called professional lobbyists to the subtle methods of influencing legislation by work at grassroots levels, sometimes referred to as indirect lobbying. The comprehensive nature of the committee's work is shown in the report.

One of the features of the committee's extensive investigation into the activities of supporters and opponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill to amend the Natural Gas Act (84th Cong.) was the disclosure that substantial contributions to groups active on said bill had been or were being treated by the contributors as ordinary business expenses, with the result that the Government was helping to defray the cost of activities to influence legislation to the extent of approximately \$1 million. At the conclusion of the committee's hearing on this phase, the income tax feature was taken up with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As a result, the committee has been advised by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that the conclusion reached by his Department is "that contributions to the committee [Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee] do not qualify as allowable deductions for Federal in-

come tax purposes" (pp. 16, 17).¹ As a result, the Government stands to collect additional taxes of around \$1 million from this source alone.

Another tax aspect considered by the committee has to do with so-called institutional advertising which does not specifically point to legislation but which tends to accomplish the same result by subtle means. On this score, a matter directly under the jurisdiction of the Internal Revenue Bureau, the report observes (p. 82):

"Also worthy of special attention by the Bureau of Internal Revenue are newspaper and magazine advertisements by varied interests which do not expressly support or oppose legislation but tend to accomplish the same result indirectly by subtle means, the cost of which is also treated as a business expense."

Turning from the extensive investigation conducted and study made by the special committee on the subjects of lobbying and campaign finances—dealt with and discussed at length in the report—to the legislative problems forming such an important part of the committee's work, it is the conclusion of the committee that the best available cure for vices that exist or may result from deficiencies in existing laws in both fields is the spotlight of publicity.

In this connection, the observation made by Justice Brandeis, in coping with an analogous problem, is appropriate. He said—

"Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most efficient policeman."

AS TO LOBBYING

The report summarizes the testimony adduced before the committee; describes the nature and extent of the committee's work and investigations; gives the history and background of existing laws and operations thereunder; discusses the many problems presented for committee consideration; and contains specific recommendations by the committee, implemented by a comprehensive proposed new law.

The present Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act has been in operation since 1946, being the first Federal statute on the subject. The statute has proven beneficial but has been found, by experience, to contain a number of uncertainties on important aspects and also to be deficient and inadequate in other respects.

Some of the important provisions of the bill recommended by the committee are:

A. Title of act

The present Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act does not regulate, is not truly descriptive, and is otherwise objectionable. The committee believes that a more appropriate designation would be "Legislative Activities Disclosure Act."

B. Administration

Under existing law, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are mere depositories for statements and reports required to be filed under the act. The act imposes no other duties and responsibilities except the compilation of information for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under the bill recommended by the committee, the Comptroller General is designated as the Administrator and charged with certain duties and responsibilities which it is felt will result in the effective administration of the act (secs. 303, 304; p. 98).

C. Registration requirements

The committee's bill requires persons who are deemed to be legislative agents to file notices of representation, identifying themselves and their principals and stating the

¹Numbers in parentheses denote page numbers of final report unless otherwise indicated.

terms of their representation. A legislative agent is defined under the act as a person who, for any consideration, is employed or retained to influence legislation, in person or through any other person, by means of direct communications to Congress. Persons intended to be included under the definition of legislative agent constitute the so-called professional group in the lobbying field. For a more detailed explanation, see page 94 under group 1.

D. Reporting requirements

Every legislative agent must file a report, setting forth his receipts and expenditures, in such form as the Administrator shall prescribe. Reports must also be filed by the following:

1. Any person who employs or retains 1 or more legislative agents and who makes an expenditure of \$300 or more in any calendar quarter to influence legislation;
2. Any person who receives \$300 or more in a calendar quarter as compensation or reimbursed expenses (exclusive of personal travel expenses), or both, for the purpose of influencing legislation by direct communication;
3. Any person who requests or procures another to communicate directly with Congress to influence legislation if (a) the request or procurement is in writing and is addressed or distributed to more than 1,000 persons, or (b) the expense of the communication requested or procured is paid or agreed to be paid by the person making the request or procurement, and more than 25 persons are solicited to make such communication; and
4. Any person who has made expenditures exceeding \$50,000 in the aggregate within the preceding 12 months in presenting a program addressed to the public, a substantial portion of which is intended, designed, or calculated to influence legislation. (Sec. 306; p. 96 under groups 5, 6, and 7.)

It is to be observed that the foregoing includes so-called indirect lobbying activities if done on a substantial scale.

E. Penalties

The committee's bill imposes criminal penalties for violations arising from direct lobbying activities and, in order to satisfy constitutional guaranties and to promote the objectives of the act, imposes civil penalties for violations under so-called indirect lobbying activities, with ultimate enforcement of civil penalties via injunction, etc.

Penalties have also been provided for transmission to Congress of spurious communications (sec. 311, p. 101), which the committee has condemned in its report thus (p. 80):

"Practices like these which pollute the stream of our legislative processes must be eliminated."

For complete details of the committee's recommended bill and a comparison with the existing law, see pages 97-105, with explanatory data at pages 93-96.

Summarizing, the reporting requirements have been improved, the law tightened, and streamlined in a number of respects, and standards set forth which will enable those interested to determine more readily whether or not they are subject to the provisions of the act.

Throughout its consideration of the subject, the committee has been mindful of the right of each citizen to petition the Congress under the first amendment to the Constitution. Apart from the traditional right of petition, the actual exercise of such right by our citizens is recommended by Members of Congress for the reason, among others, that the presentation of the views of the citizens, either in support of or in opposition to, proposed legislation is helpful in producing constructive legislation. The exercise of the right of petition has proven

to be a valuable aid to Members of Congress in their quest for legislation that will prove beneficial to the Nation.

AS TO CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The report summarizes testimony given before the committee; describes certain phases of its investigations; states the views of former Members of the Senate, political scientists, and others concerning important aspects of the subject; states the conclusions and specific recommendations of the committee; and contains a proposed new law to implement the recommendations of the committee.

The report is not unanimous on all aspects of campaign financing, the separate views of several members of the committee being stated independently in connection with certain phases.

All of the members of the committee agree, as noted earlier, on the benefits derived from the spotlight of publicity.

Some of the important changes proposed under the committee's bill may be summarized as follows:

A. Title of act

The name of the law is "Political Activities Disclosure Act." The title of the present law, "Federal Corrupt Practices Act," is not truly descriptive of the subject matter, and is misleading (sec. 266; pp. 139, 153).

B. Administration

As is the case under the Lobbying Act, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are mere depositories of statements and reports which are required to be filed under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, no duties or responsibilities being imposed upon either to administer the act. As is the case under the Lobbying Act, two places are designated for the filing of statements and reports under varying circumstances. The committee proposes that the designation of the Comptroller General, as administrator, with specified duties and responsibilities to effectuate the purposes and objectives of the law, will accomplish the goal of effective administration (secs. 242, 251; pp. 139, 145, 149).

C. Reporting requirements

The reporting requirements under the committee's bill have been streamlined and extended. All political committees, with an exception later noted, are required to report. For example, intrastate political committees, which are not required to file any reports under the present act, will be required to do so under the committee's bill. Extension of the areas of publicity, as provided in the committee's bill, will, it is hoped, prove beneficial. The committee has decided that political committees whose receipts or expenditures are inconsequential should be excluded from the reporting requirements, and has therefore provided an exception in its bill, to wit, that if a committee does not receive or expend more than \$1,000 in any calendar year or does not receive any contributions exceeding \$100 from one person, it is not to be deemed to be a political committee subject to reporting requirements (sec. 241; p. 139).

It is also proposed that reports must be filed by those who make expenditures of \$100 or more in behalf of a candidate or political committee (other than by contributions) or contribute \$3,000 or more to a candidate or political committee in a presidential election (sec. 248).

D. Fiscal agent

The committee's bill provides for the appointment of a fiscal agent by each candidate, with the right of a candidate to designate himself as such (sec. 246; pp. 139, 146). Such designation will centralize responsibility and improve the reporting procedure.

E. Limitations on contributions and expenditures

As to limitations on contributions and expenditures, the committee's bill makes radical changes, briefly described as follows:

1. No limitations are imposed in presidential contests. Although the present law imposes a limitation of \$3 million on contributions that may be received or expended by a political committee during any calendar year, there is actually no genuine limitation since there is no bar to the formation of any number of additional committees desired, each one of which would be competent to receive and expend \$3 million in any calendar year. The committee believes that a realistic approach requires that the fixation of any limitation in presidential contests should be removed.

2. Although there is considerable sentiment for the removal of ceilings in senatorial contests as well, the committee is not prepared to recommend such removal at this time. It is the feeling of the committee, however, that the amount of any limitation should be raised substantially from present levels and that a workable and reasonable limitation would be an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total population of the State at the last decennial census (sec. 245; pp. 141, 146).

3. As to contests for Representative at Large, the committee recommends the same formula applicable to senatorial contests.

4. As to district contests for the House of Representatives, the committee provides in its bill that the same 10-cent formula be applied except that the Congressional district shall be substituted for the State.

5. In order to strike a balance between cases where candidates with unlimited personal funds to spend in their own behalf are opposed by less affluent candidates, and cases where candidates are unable to raise outside funds to finance their campaigns, the committee has provided in its bill for the following limitations on a candidate's personal expenditures:

(a) In a senatorial contest, a candidate shall not be permitted to spend more than 15 percent of the prescribed ceiling out of his personal funds, or \$10,000, whichever is higher, but in no event more than \$25,000 (sec. 245; pp. 141, 146).

(b) In a contest for Representative at Large, the same standard as for senatorial candidate is applicable.

(c) In a contest for Representative, a candidate should be permitted to spend up to 15 percent of his ceiling, but in no event more than \$10,000.

6. It is proposed that expenditures made by a committee authorized to support a candidate shall be included in the computation of the candidate's ceiling, and that where such approval is lacking, a limitation of \$1,000 is placed on such expenditures. Excepted from these provisions are regular State central, county and local committees, which invariably support tickets with multiple candidates, National and State and also local (sec. 245; p. 142).

7. Contributions in any name but that of the actual donor are prohibited, as are contributions in excess of \$100 by a person under 18 years (sec. 151; p. 142).

8. Individual contributions have been limited by a majority of the committee to \$5,000 for one candidate for Federal office, or an aggregate of \$15,000 for all candidates and political committees, in any calendar year, with a further provision requiring a 1-year lag between maximum permissible contributions and subsequent ones. A further restriction has been provided that any contribution made before June 30 of each year is a violation of the statute if, coupled with contributions made the preceding cal-

endar year, the aggregate exceeds the limitations provided, (pp. 142, 154).

F. Early filing dates

Earlier filing dates of reports are provided in the committee's bill in order to allow more preselection time for the perusal of reports (sec. 247).

G. Primary elections

The committee was evenly divided on the question whether primary elections should be included or excluded under the new act (sec. 241; p. 140).

H. Section 315, Federal Communications Act

The committee has recommended that section 315 of the Federal Communications Act be amended to provide for the allowance of equal broadcasting time to minority parties, upon condition that a minority party drew 5 percent of the vote at the last election, or, if a new party, presents a petition signed by 2 percent of the vote at the last election (p. 143).

I. Tax deduction

Another recommendation made by the committee is to allow taxpayers the right to deduct from gross income all political contributions up to the sum of \$100.

Acknowledgment must be made of the great amount of time and effort devoted by all committee members to the important work of the committee. Despite heavy burdens, all members of the committee made extraordinary efforts to help solve the problems before the committee. The chairman wishes to record his deep appreciation to all members of the committee for their invaluable assistance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the devoted attention of members of the committee, each one of them, to the problems and work of the committee, and to express my thanks for the contribution made by each member of the committee. I also wish to acknowledge the diligent and conscientious efforts of the fine staff associated with the committee and to thank the staff for its invaluable contributions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and printed, together with the individual views, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

UNITED STATES CREDITED FOR GERMAN RECOVERY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a short time ago there was published in the Duluth News-Tribune an article reporting a tour by a group of 10 German construction leaders of the recently constructed housing projects in northeastern Minnesota. In this connection Eckehard O. Rastedter, a Berlin consulting engineer, spoke at a dinner sponsored by the Duluth building industry on May 27 and discussed the importance of American aid in the restoration of German economy since World War II.

Mr. Rastedter referred to the Berlin airlift as the most spectacular demonstration of the will of the American people to help the cause of freedom in Western Europe.

He went on to say that Germany's miraculous recovery would never have happened without the generous support of the American Government and of the American people.

Mr. President, this expression of appreciation for American aid is very timely now when the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is considering President Eisenhower's recommendations for improving this obviously effective program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article which appeared in the May 28th Duluth News-Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN ENGINEER CREDITS UNITED STATES FOR GERMAN RECOVERY

(By Einar W. Karlstrand)

Germany's rapid recovery from World War II damage was attributed largely to American aid last night by a Berlin consulting structural engineer.

Eckehard O. Rastedter, one of 10 visiting German construction industry leaders, made this report at a dinner sponsored by the Duluth building industry in the Kitchi Gammi club.

The group yesterday viewed Iron Range construction and today will go to Silver Bay for a tour of the Reserve Mining Co.'s townsite and other properties.

Rastedter said that the miraculous recovery of Germany would never have happened without the generous support of the American Government and of the American people.

He reported that within 6 years after the war, production and investments in western Germany reached the prewar level and shortly after surpassed it.

Germany's exports by 1953 exceeded those of the prewar period, he said.

The speaker explained that his homeland has attempted to ease the housing shortage by building or rebuilding an average of about 500,000 dwelling units a year since 1948 with the help of American capital.

"Besides providing apartments for the large number of families who need them," Rastedter said, "we have actively engaged in building or repairing a great many schools, hospitals, and churches for current needs."

The experience of the world's best architects is being used to spur German construction, he reported.

A part of this plan, he said, is the Berlin International Building Exposition of 1957 which opens in Germany's capital city June 15.

The ideas and styles conceived by the internationally known architects will be demonstrated as full-sized houses of 1 to 18 stories high. They will become regular dwelling units after the exposition.

Rastedter noted that he and his colleagues have profited tremendously from what they have seen and heard in their current United States trip.

At Biwabik yesterday they saw how a complete house is built at the Modern Home Manufacturing Co. plant and then shipped to the owner's homesite.

Later they visited Erie Mining Co.'s Hoyt Lakes housing project and shopping center and the company's taconite plant near Aurora. They also inspected United States Steel's Oliver iron mining division ore processing plant near Virginia.

The group heard three construction leaders explain how Erie Mining Co.'s townsite and plant were built. They are C. A. Stiles, chief project engineer; Col. C. D. Barker, Taconite Contracting Corp. labor relations director, and Gerald Galbreath, general manager of the Partridge Lakes Development Co.

Hans Jaeger, Gustavsborg, Germany, was so impressed with what he saw that he re-

marked the Federal agency in charge of the trip should have scheduled a 6-week visit in northeastern Minnesota.

Martin Ernst Abel, Wiesbaden, a technical building adviser, expressed interest in the manner personnel problems are handled in the Duluth and iron range construction industry.

Edward Barghusen, a Hamburg contractor, viewed with interest construction of concrete buildings in the area and Friedrich W. Classen, Bonn, a construction engineer, observed closely prefabricated building components.

One of the visitors, Wilhelm E. Fauner, Berlin, a professor of engineering, requested and was granted permission to try out the automatic nail machine at the Biwabik home building plant. He drew laughs from the group when he missed one of the nails.

A Hamburg architect, Heinrich P. Hans, took keen interest in Hoyt Lakes small home housing. So did Guenter P. K. Kindler, Berlin architect, who remarked that United States builders waste more materials than do those in Germany. Materials are relatively costly in Germany, they reported.

Gustav E. Kistenmacher, Heilbronn architect, observed closely school and church construction in which he is particularly interested.

Erie Mining Co.'s railroad from Aurora to Two Islands on the north shore of Lake Superior captured the interest of Ludolph D. Koehne, Hamburg. He is superintendent of construction and technical affairs for the German federal railways.

Rastedter said he was observing closely new methods used in concrete construction.

Mrs. Claire Metger, Washington, D. C., accompanied the group as an interpreter.

The visit of the German building leaders is cosponsored by the Duluth Builders Exchange, the Duluth Home Builders Association, and the International Housing Service of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Rastedter told the dinner group that Germany suffered a complete defeat early in 1945.

"Apart from the many sufferings of the people," he said, "Germany's economy was virtually at a standstill."

"The desperate situation made it necessary to make three basic provisions: To restore transportation, to rebuild industrial plants and administrative agencies, and to provide for housing."

He said that in the reconstruction program transportation had the first priority.

"We had to restore more than 7,500 bridges," he reported. "We had to repair almost the entire system of streets and highways as well as nearly all the railroad tracks."

"This was so very difficult since we had to provide food for the population and raw materials for industry. We had to repatriate displaced persons and to rescue refugees and veterans."

"Within 3 years we succeeded in putting the federal railroads back into operation. But the real start of the reconstruction period was marked by the currency reform of 1948."

It was at that point that the rebuilding of industrial plants, administrative agencies, and housing started, he said.

Nearly all the well-known old German firms and many new enterprises started borrowing the necessary capital upon their name and reputation, the speaker related.

Rastedter said the "most spectacular demonstration of the will of the American people to help the cause of freedom in Western Europe" was the famous Berlin airlift.

"I myself lived through that blockade," he said, "and shall continue to live in Berlin, hoping that city will be once more the capital of a reunited Germany."

The German guests were introduced at last night's dinner by Eugene A. Tilleaux, Washington, training officer of the International Housing Service. Robert S. Mars, Jr., Duluth Builders Exchange president, was toastmaster. Greetings were given by Mayor Eugene Lambert and Joseph Veranth, president of the Duluth Building Employers Council.

STUDENT-INTERN PROGRAM IN OFFICE OF SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if democratic government is to fulfill its most fruitful role, young people must be attracted to participate actively. Perhaps that was what was in the mind of Elihu Root, Secretary of State under President Theodore Roosevelt, when he told students at Syracuse University:

Politics is the practical exercise of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government.

Since coming to the Senate I have tried to further interest in government among young people through a student-intern program in my office. My intern for the 1957-58 Congressional year has just been chosen by a selection committee which interviewed nearly a dozen candidates for the position on my staff.

I do not interfere in any way with the choice made by the selection committee. This notable group consists of Dr. John M. Swarthout, head of the political science department of Oregon State College, as chairman; Miss May Darling, retired Portland high-school teacher; Father David H. Fosselman, of the faculty of the University of Portland; and Mr. J. W. Forrester, editor of the Pendleton East-Oregonian. Miss Elizabeth C. Ducey, a Portland women's group leader, who is in charge of my Portland office, and Mrs. Vera M. Springer, secretary in that office, act as capable aids to the committee. I have imposed no restriction as to the religion, color, sex, or political affiliation of the student thus selected each year to work in my office.

The present intern is Larry Hobart, a young journalist with an interest in political science. After he completes his term on my staff, I understand he intends to continue study in this field. If the work in my office has contributed to his interest in government, I will consider the program a success. Mr. Hobart has written an outstanding article about his experiences as a research intern in a Senator's office. The story was published in the Sunday Oregonian of May 26, 1957, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Oregonian of May 26, 1957]

OREGON COLLEGE STUDENTS LEARN THE INNER WORKINGS OF NATIONAL POLITICS DURING YEAR SPENT AS ASSISTANT TO SENATOR NEUBERGER

Each year a committee of Oregon civic leaders and educators selects a graduating senior, or recent graduate of an Oregon college, to serve for 1 year as a salaried research intern in the Washington office of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

Graduates in any field are eligible for selection if they have informed interest in the problems of government and public policy. Party affiliation is not a factor. This year's internee, Larry Hobart, is a Republican.

Purpose of the program is to offer public-spirited young Oregon citizens a year of practical experience in government as a background for future participation in community affairs or possibly for a career in government. The intern's assignments are designed to acquaint him with the legislative process as seen in the daily work of Congress. Several Senators from other States are planning to follow Senator NEUBERGER's lead in setting up this program.

Members of the intern-selection committee include Miss May Darling, member of the State board of education, Portland; J. W. Forrester, editor of the Pendleton East-Oregonian and a member of the State board of higher education; Father David H. Fosselman, of the faculty of University of Portland; and Dr. John W. Swarthout, head of the political science department of Oregon State college and chairman of the committee.

"CAPITOL CLASSROOM"

"(By Larry Hobart)"

"During the past 9 months I have participated in a unique on-the-job training course in American government. As a 'research intern' in the office of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER I have been witness to the daily operating routine of the 'world's most exclusive club'—the United States Senate.

"My wife, Judy, and I came to Washington in September 1956. Our closest previous touch with active politics was Judy's candidacy for president of the sophomore class at the University of Oregon. In Washington we found a strange, new, partisan world.

"Shoptalk' in Washington means politics. In Salem, my hometown, political discussions seemed somewhat abstract; political science courses at the University of Oregon dwelt on government structure, separation of powers, checks and balances. In Washington a crucial Senate vote can mean the displacement of a party spokesman, establishment of a political debit or a vote-getting credit, the loss of a job.

"I was riding down an elevator in the Senate Office Building the day the Senate met to organize for the 85th Congress, when the young elevator operator asked me if I had heard how Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, intended to vote. Rumors were flying that day as the clock approached 12 noon, and I replied that it was apparently still questionable whether LAUSCHE would line up with the Republicans or the Democrats.

"Gee, I sure hope he votes with the Democrats," the operator said. 'I don't know how I'll get through school this year if he doesn't; I'll lose my job.' He was one of dozens of college students who finance their way through a Washington university by holding down a patronage position.

"Senators enjoy great prestige on Capitol Hill. Elevators are summoned at the sound of the traditional three buzzes and halted at the Senator's command. Passengers on the subway cars which run between the Capitol and the Senate Office Building must give up their seats to Senators. However, I failed to realize just how much weight the office carried in Washington until I made my first request of a Government agency.

"When I telephoned for a pamphlet containing statistical information my call was transferred from department to department, each disclaiming any jurisdiction over the material. When I finally located the correct office and placed my order I waited 3 days for the information to arrive.

"When I mentioned this communications problem to a senatorial staff member he laughed. 'You just didn't phrase your request correctly,' he said. 'You should say, 'the Senator wishes to obtain the following

information.'"

My next call was referred directly to a special Congressional liaison office; the material arrived by messenger the same day.

"The workload of the Senate is tremendous. Statistics for the 84th Congress graphically illustrate the burden.

"The Committee on Government Operations reported that between January 5, 1955, and July 27, 1956, Senators considered in committee meetings (where 90 percent of the Senate's legislative work is carried out) a total of 7,290 legislative proposals, of which 4,835 originated in the Senate. Of these measures, 3,053 were reported from committee and 1,921 became laws.

"If the Senator spent 1 hour studying and familiarizing himself with each bill and joint resolution reported to the Senate in the 84th Congress he would have put in over 380 full working days before he completed the task.

"Even if this herculean job were feasible, other senatorial responsibilities would prevent its accomplishment. It is estimated that 3,951 Senate committee meetings were held during the 84th Congress, occupying a total of 11,677 hours. Senators may serve on 2 to 3 standing committees, as many as 14 subcommittees.

"These calculations do not include time spent relative to activities of the 24 boards and commissions of which Senators are members, party and policy meetings, legislative conferences, testimony before committees, reviewing and revising committee reports, preparing speeches, maintaining correspondence and a host of other duties.

"Senators are bombarded with letters. Senator NEUBERGER's office receives an average of 200 pieces of mail a day while Congress is in session. Communications range from pleas for legal advice in divorce suits and tax tangles to demands for a stated position on salvage of tin cans and suggestions for the development of a perpetual-motion machine, from grateful support of pending legislation to violent damnation of a proposed bill.

"In all senatorial offices an attempt is made to answer every letter from within the Senator's State; out-of-State mail receives a lower priority. Mass mailings of form letters tend to be answered in kind, due to the limitations of time and staff.

"As if the normal barrage of letters were not enough, some Senators solicit additional mail. Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON recently announced he had written to 39,000 Texans asking for 'recommendations and advice.' Senator THOMAS MARTIN of Iowa conducts an annual poll of voters in his State.

"Nothing is better calculated to impress the westerner with the newness of his State than a tour through one of Washington's antique homes located in Georgetown, a fashionable suburb.

"The Federal-type architecture and vertical construction are a marked contrast to the rambling one-story houses to which we were accustomed. A trip from the basement to the third-floor guest rooms is an exhausting experience.

"When we returned to our four-room apartment following one of these stair-climbing expeditions, Judy sank into a chair and announced: 'Please don't let me complain again about the housework here; it would take a week to dust that thing from top to bottom.'

"Call it patriotism or Potomac fever, sentiment or respect, there is a sense of history about Washington which affects even the most casual observer.

"When Judy insisted upon taking our 6-month daughter Jennifer with us when we visited Mount Vernon recently, I argued that a trip to Washington's home would make little impression on a baby. 'I know it's silly,' she replied, 'but I just want her to be

able to tell her own children she's been there."

"I stood on the Senate floor on one Tuesday evening in March as the clerk called the roll for the final vote on passage of the Middle East resolution. As each Senator answered with his 'yea' or 'nay,' I couldn't help feeling a thrill of excitement. One hundred years ago such men as Stephen A. Douglas, Charles Sumner, and Jefferson Davis were discussing the Dred Scott decision in the Senate Chamber. Within minutes this vote would also be history.

"Senator NEUBERGER's research intern program was initiated in 1955. It has been highly successful in its aim, encouraging young people to take a more active interest in our Government. Dick Judd, a former Lewis and Clark student and the first intern, is now on the staff of Senator WAYNE MORSE. Eric Coorsanger, a graduate of Reed College, returned to Oregon to work with the bureau of municipal research at the University of Oregon. Thomas L. Murdock, of Klamath Falls, a Willamette University senior in political science, has been announced as the 1957-58 intern, and will take place next September.

"The program has also succeeded in counteracting, in a small way, the popular assumption that politics is a dirty business, fit only for hacks.

"Our Government is not a theoretical mechanism to me any longer." Voorsanger concluded, following his year in Washington. "Nor are the disappointments and inefficiencies of Government totally without explanation, for I think I have learned that government does not exist separate from politics. Good government, likewise, depends on good politics.

"I have learned to respect the role of compromise, but have been heartened to see the courage of a number of Members of Congress who will stand for what they believe while others care little."

"A few weeks before I left Salem for Washington, I was discussing the year ahead with a friend. 'You must be crazy,' he said. 'Here your wife is due to have a baby within a few weeks. You just returned from the service and haven't seen your old friends for nearly 2 years. And now you're leaving for Washington on a temporary position with a politician. But,' he added, 'it should be a rewarding and exciting experience.'

"And it has been."

EMPLOYMENT OF JOURNALISTS BY UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because there was some discussion on the floor last week about the practice of the United States Information Agency in employing journalists to write material for the Agency, I have asked Mrs. Blair Moody, the widow of a former illustrious Member of the Senate, and congressional liaison officer for the United States Information Agency, to provide me with the background information explaining this particular procedure.

I have received, under date of May 29, a letter from Mrs. Moody, with certain accompanying material relating to this practice of the United States Information Agency.

For the information of the Senate and of the press, I ask unanimous consent that the statement sent to me by Mrs. Blair Moody be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Charge: That the Agency buys news stories from newspapermen throughout the United States at a cost of more than \$50,000 a year to create a built-in pro-USIA propaganda setup.

During fiscal year 1956, the Agency used the free-lance services of about 300 stringers scattered about the country. Most of these individuals were journalists or reporters, recommended to the Agency by their city editors, who were hired by the Agency on a word-rate basis of 2 cents per word to write special articles for use overseas. Since most of the stringers who receive assignments from USIA work for American newspapers as reporters, they hardly would be in a position to influence the policies of their respective newspapers with respect to the activities or operations of the United States Information Agency. Most of the articles obtained from these individuals related to the activities of foreign visitors to this country. The Agency believes that the things these visitors do or find out about this country are of great interest to their compatriots overseas. Their stories are considered a most effective method of conveying a picture of America to people overseas through the eyes and words of their own compatriots.

The cheapest way to get such a story—about, for example, the activities of a Vietnamese who is visiting Minneapolis—is to hire a writer in Minneapolis to do an article about the visitor, rather than send a man out from Washington to get the story. In fiscal year 1956, the Agency spent \$26,821 for a total of 1,306 individual stories on foreign visitors and current events of significance (average of \$20.24 per story).

In addition, the Agency in fiscal year 1956 spent \$16,095 for other free-lance services, which provided materials for 7 pamphlets and 115 special magazine articles for the periodicals America Illustrated and Problems of Communism (average cost per article of \$126.50).

The various stories and articles procured from stringers do not mention or publicize the activities of the United States Information Agency. Use of such stories and articles is based on a solid and demonstrable program need. The charge that use of these individuals creates a pro-USIA propaganda setup is considered to be without basis.

FLOODS IN THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the disaster-weary Southwest has again been battered by torrential rains, high winds, hail, and tornadoes.

The news ticker has just brought us the latest story of disaster. Flash floods have hit the city of Fort Worth and high winds have blown apart buildings in southwest Texas.

There is only one cheerful note—this time no injuries or deaths were reported and the damage was described as "slight in comparison with other recent flood and tornado disasters."

Mr. President, this whole situation puts in bold relief the tragedy of inaction. Over every wrecked building and over the grave of everyone who has been killed by these disasters should be placed the sign "too little and too late."

The news ticker also records the experiences of the House Public Works Subcommittee, which is touring the area. One of the members, Representative ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, said that dams on the Navasota at Waco, Lampasas, and

Ferguson would have prevented much of the recent damage.

Representative JAMES WRIGHT, of Texas, says that dams should be constructed at Laneport, Lampasas, Ferguson, Summerville, and Waco.

Mr. President, earlier in the week, I said to the Senate that we must get ahead with the program of constructing dams on the Pedernales and San Gabriel Rivers where there have occurred great loss of property and great loss of life in the past few weeks.

We are getting ready to consider the public works bill in the Senate. I hope that when it comes to the floor every Senator will have vividly in his mind the tragedy of too little and too late.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the people of Texas from the floor of the Senate that I do not know of any Member of the Senate who over the years has worked harder for flood-control projects everywhere in the United States than the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I am sure I speak for the people of my own State and of the whole Pacific Northwest when I say that I extend to the people of Texas our deepest sympathy for the tragedies they have suffered from the terrible floods. I say to the people of Texas they have every reason to have great pride and confidence in their senior Senator, the majority leader, who has been fighting in the Senate for flood-control projects everywhere.

I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate, both Republican and Democrat, that we ought to rally around both Senators from Texas when the public works bill comes before us, and come to the relief of the State of Texas.

Many persons do not realize that for the past several years 244 out of the 254 counties in Texas have been water-disaster areas because of drought. Now nature has completely changed its course and whole sections of Texas are being flooded.

It proves the need for man to take the precautionary and preventive steps necessary to bring, wherever possible, the forces of nature under control.

I say to the Senators from Texas that in me they have a shoulder-to-shoulder ally because I think all of us owe it to the people of Texas to give them relief in this year's public works bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his statement. The 9 million people of my State welcome his assistance and his cooperation. We know that the Senator from Oregon always extends a generous hand to people in need, whether they are in the Northwest or in the Southwest.

Homes would be standing today, and men, women, and children would still be alive, if Congress had acted in time.

I am hoping that there will be early and complete surveys by the Army engineers of all the principal rivers and their tributaries in Texas, where so many

lives have been lost and so many millions of dollars worth of property destroyed. I am hoping, as the result of such surveys, that Congress will take some emergency action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The people of Texas know, I am sure, that the leadership of their senior Senator from Texas will be responded to by his colleagues. I assure the Senator that there is one vote I have something to say about, namely my own vote, and when the flood-control projects come before the Senate in the public works bill, those projects will receive my wholehearted support.

The State of Minnesota, on occasion, has been the victim of floods. Like the Senator from Texas, I have always felt that had we had a little vision and had we taken some preventive action, we would not have had to suffer such serious human and economic losses as ultimately took place.

I assure the Senator from Texas that his plea for action by the Senate will receive enthusiastic and wholehearted response to the limit of my capacity and ability when the public works bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am grateful for the expression of my good friend from Minnesota. He and I walked along the Pedernales River together. Only last week two women and a baby started down the highway that runs along that river. A flash flood came up. The mother and baby were drowned, and the other woman spent a night in a treetop. That happened because of "too little and too late." That tragedy could have been prevented if a dam had been constructed on the river. A survey had been authorized, but no action was taken.

I am hopeful that the disaster which has occurred, and which we have been able to endure, will serve as a lesson to Congress and perhaps bring vividly to its attention the fact that an investment in flood control is the best insurance policy Congress can buy.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from the United Press news ticker be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT WORTH, TEX.—A House Public Works Subcommittee today flew over flood-ravaged portions of Oklahoma and Arkansas in the second day of its flood and drought inspection.

The subcommittee, consisting of Representatives JAMES WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas, Ed EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and EMMET BYRNE, Republican, of Illinois, made a 600-mile aerial tour over the swollen Brazos and Trinity Rivers in Texas yesterday after holding hearings in Fort Worth.

The group is trying to assess damage from recent floods, check the effectiveness of existing flood-control projects, and make legislative plans for prevention of both future floods and droughts. The region was in the throes of an 8-year drought before the torrential rains fell.

The committee flew over farms where crops once wouldn't grow because of a lack of moisture and now can't be planted because of too much. The committee saw farmhouses isolated by water, areas in cities still bearing the scars of floods, farmlands flooded, and reservoirs spilling away excess water.

EDMONDSON said the area urgently needs three reservoirs to control floodwaters and store water for use during drought. He said had there been dams at Waco, Lampasas, and Ferguson on the Navasota, they would have prevented heavy damage to agriculture. The whole basin system should be controlled, he said. EDMONDSON gave no priority to any 1 of the 3 possible dams.

WRIGHT said dams should be constructed at Laneport, Lampasas, Ferguson, Summer-ville, and Waco. It is probable, he said, the Congress would approve the Waco Dam and the Proctor Dam, above the Belton Reservoir.

DALLAS, TEX.—Torrential rains, high winds, hail, and tornadoes returned to a wide area of Texas last night. They caused flash floods in soggy Fort Worth and ripped apart buildings in southwest Texas.

A cloudburst dropped 2.22 inches of rain on Fort Worth in 30 minutes and sent flash floods over the tops of cars in underpasses.

High winds possibly of tornado force howled over Monahans, in southwest Texas, destroying two 1-story buildings. A host of tornadoes was sighted in that area and as far north as Fort Worth.

There were no injuries, however, and damage was believed slight in comparison with other recent floods and tornado disasters.

"REACTIONARY" SOCIALISM IN GERMANY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, whenever socialism has been tried it has always disappointed. It has resulted in inflation, increased poverty, and a denial of a standard of living which otherwise might have been attained.

I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald of May 23, 1957. The editorial recounts a happening which should bring hope to those who oppose socialism. It is entitled "Reactionary Socialism." It reads:

REACTIONARY SOCIALISM

Last week Germany's Minister of Economy, Dr. Ludwig Erhard, announced that Government trusteeship of the Volkswagen automobile works would end and that the company would be sold to thousands of small shareholders.

In other words, the Volkswagen is returning to private enterprise. Its management will be responsible to the stockholders who, in turn, expect a profit.

That's plain old-fashioned capitalism, and it's interesting to note how the Volkswagen decision is being received in Germany.

Dr. Erhard said the sale is a means of achieving a broader ownership of the means of production in West Germany. He said it is the Christian Democrats' answer to the reactionary Socialist policy of state ownership or control.

The Socialists are alarmed and angry. They recognize that the sale is highly popular with the people, so instead of meeting the issue head on and defending state ownership, they are claiming politics and charging that the moderate Adenauer government is electioneering by catering to the popular will.

To American ears these charges may sound strange but it's explained that this is not the case in Europe. Socialism is old stuff

there, both the soft socialism of the Social Democrats and the hard socialism of Hitler. The new appeal, the attractive appeal, is private ownership.

Chancellor Adenauer's economics minister says the Volkswagen sale is only the beginning. Eventually, he says, the West German Government will sell all the Government's industrial holdings, estimated at \$1 billion, to private investors.

Americans, who are sometimes apologetic about the enterprise system, may learn a lesson here. If collectivist theories are old fashioned and reactionary and hard to sell to the voters in Europe, they should be doubly hard to sell to the voters in successful America. The forward look in economic systems is not Marxism, with its dreary theme of share the poverty, but the enterprise system with its widely dispersed wealth.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENT PROBLEMS WITH CUBA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on May 13 I discussed on the floor of the Senate some of our reciprocal-trade-agreement problems with our neighbor to the south, Cuba.

Cuba has been a traditional supplier of sugar to the United States, and, in turn, Cuba has been a major market for wheat flour from the United States. Both commodities have been included in the preferential trade treaties negotiated between the two countries over a long period of time, and they provide the type of reciprocity in trade which I believe is true reciprocity. Each commodity represents an industry which is basic to the country and for which it has many natural advantages for production and export.

Last year, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I assisted in working out some of the amendments to the extension of the Sugar Act of 1948. I, for one, insisted that we grant Cuba a generous share of our sugar imports, and I did this even though technically we might be able to become self-sufficient in sugar production, although I realize it would be an uneconomic production.

At the time I made my statement on the Senate floor regarding some of our reciprocal-trade problems with Cuba, I was advised that the Cubans were proposing to build a flour mill in Santiago, Cuba, under special concessions and protection which they hoped to receive from the Cuban Government. Another group was proposing a mill at Cienfuegos.

It is generally agreed that should the Cuban Government give approval to these projects our present flour exports to that country, as we have known them in the past, would come to an end. This, of course, would mean a permanent loss of much of the Cuban market for United States wheat, as well as flour, because the record clearly shows that when a flour mill is built in a foreign country, imports of United States flour are not automatically replaced with United States wheat.

I am pleased to advise the Senate today that information has come to me that the Cuban Cabinet has informed the National Bank and its affiliates that they refused to give their approval, even

though it may mean loss in the commitment to the Santiago project.

I am also informed that the two proposed mills for customs exemption have been rejected by the Cuban Government.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the action which has been taken by the officials of the Cuban Government in this regard. This attitude on the part of the Cuban Government and its people further strengthens my belief in the fact that reciprocal trade is a two-way street, and can be used to the mutual advantage of two countries. I hope this will become a pattern with other nations with which we have reciprocal trade agreements.

This decision will mean much to the farmers of the United States who have already been forced to reduce their wheat production from approximately 80 million acres in 1951 to 55 million acres in 1957, under Federal restrictions.

I can assure my colleagues this is important to the wheat growers of Kansas, in that in 1951 we planted approximately 18 million acres of wheat, and last year our allotment acreage was 10.8 million acres, and our actual seeding, as a result of drought and unfavorable fall seeding conditions, was 6.3 million acres.

If more countries realize that access to the United States market also means some obligations on their part not to adopt measures which will hurt or restrict the market for United States commodities, we will have accomplished much in the way of friendly trade relations.

RAPID TAX AMORTIZATION BY IDAHO POWER CO.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on May 28, 1957, a spirited debate took place in the Senate between the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] concerning rapid tax amortization by the Idaho Power Co.

In order to secure the facts concerning this matter, I addressed a letter dated May 31, 1957, to Mr. Charles Kendall, General Counsel of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my letter to Mr. Kendall and his reply thereto.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1957.

MR. CHARLES KENDALL,
General Counsel, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENDALL: I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28 the following colloquy between Senator CAPEHART and Senator MORSE covering the amortization of the Idaho Power Co.:

"Mr. CAPEHART. There, again, if the Senator from Oregon will read the letter of the Secretary, and will analyze it, he will find that that situation is somewhat the same as the one about which he was complaining, when he said he was misquoted.

"Furthermore, he said this particular job will not be completed until 1961. Does the Senator from Oregon not know that the cer-

tificate will become void if the job is not completed by 1958, and that then the company will lose the certificate?

"Mr. MORSE. But in the meantime, the company will have collected all the advantages of the fast tax writeoff.

"Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to say to the able Senator from Oregon that the writeoff is 20 percent a year for 5 years.

"Mr. MORSE. Yes; and the company will get that much for every year it is allowed to get by with it.

"Mr. CAPEHART. But the certificate of necessity will not begin until the project is finished.

"Mr. MORSE. That is just where the Senator from Indiana is completely wrong.

"Mr. CAPEHART. I am not wrong.

"Mr. MORSE. It begins immediately after it is granted. The company will write it off, on its next year's tax report. What does the Senator from Indiana suppose the company wants it for? The company wants it in order to get it to help it build the project. That is why the company wants these millions of dollars of hand-outs—namely, to help it build the dams, at the cost to the taxpayers.

"Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon was never more mistaken in all his life, because the certificate cannot begin until the project is finished and until the total cost is known. I challenge the Senator from Oregon to prove that that statement is not true.

"Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe in doing my book work, and I will do it; and I will raise the question tomorrow.

"Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been engaged in business. I am sure I am right about the matter; I will be amazed if I am wrong. It is impossible to obtain a certificate for a writeoff before the job is completed and before the cost of the materials used is known."

I would like to know which Senator is correct, and also would like to have your legal opinion.

Sincerely,

HENRY DWORSHAK.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1957.

Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: This has reference to your letter of May 31, 1957, in which you quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28 the colloquy between Senator CAPEHART and Senator MORSE relative to the accelerated amortization deduction as it applies to the Idaho Power Co. projects at Oxbow and Brownlee. You ask, "Which Senator is correct?" and request my legal opinion.

The last sentence of section 168 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which provides for the accelerated amortization deduction reads as follows:

"The 60-month period shall begin as to any emergency facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed or acquired, or with the succeeding taxable year."

The Bureau of Internal Revenue has informed us that the foregoing is interpreted literally and that accelerated amortization may not be taken until a facility is actually completed.

Any suggestion that the amortization deduction on the cost of a facility may be taken upon the commencement of or during the construction of a facility is incorrect.

In the case of the Idaho Power Co.'s Brownlee and Oxbow Dams, the certificates

place the further restriction upon use of accelerated amortization that the facilities must be in operation on or before December 31, 1958. If the target date is met, the cost of the dams may be charged against taxable income at the accelerated rate in the following taxable years.

In summary, it may be stated that the Idaho Power Co. will not be able to take accelerated amortization on either the Brownlee or Oxbow Dams until such dams are completed and in no case will they be entitled to such deduction unless the facilities are in operation on or before December 31, 1958.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. KENDALL,
General Counsel.

WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the time the nomination of Scott McLeod was pending in the Senate, the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked to prepare a memorandum concerning the number of instances of nominations submitted by administrations, past and present, having been withdrawn from the Committee on Foreign Relations. The official staff memorandum was prepared and made available to members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a copy of it being made available to me. I used it in the debate on May 8, 1957. A part of the memorandum dealt with the case of one Seymour Rubin, to be Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Administration.

In the course of my speech on May 8, 1957, at page 6577 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I cited from the memorandum prepared by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations and made the following statement:

I point out that the cases I have just mentioned involved nominations during the Truman administration. We also have the case of the nomination of Seymour Rubin, to be Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Administration. The nomination was made by President Truman, but was withdrawn by President Eisenhower. So this is a procedure which has been followed in various administrations.

I have received a letter from Mr. Rubin, who is a member of the law firm of Landis, Cohen, Rubin & Schwartz.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with certain exhibits which Mr. Rubin filed with his letter.

There being no objection, the letter and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANDIS, COHEN, RUBIN & SCHWARTZ,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1957.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write on what I suppose might be called on the floor of the Senate a point of personal privilege. I believe you would want to correct an unfortunate inference, arising from your remarks of May 8, 1957, in regard to the McLeod appointment, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and/or the Eisenhower administration found me wanting in qualifications for the post of Assistant Director for Mutual Security.

The facts are:

I have been in the private practice of law since 1948. In 1951-52 I took on, at the request of the State Department and of Mutual Security Director Harriman, a short-term (2 months) negotiating job involving our relations with the NATO countries, and was fortunate enough to achieve the desired results. As a result, Mr. Harriman asked me, in the fall of 1952, to take on responsibility as his deputy for the Battle Act, with the title of Assistant Director for Mutual Security. I consented to do this, on the clear understanding that mine was again to be a short-term responsibility, that I would in any case resign in early 1953 to return to my law practice, and that the situation would be reexamined after the November 1952 elections.

On September 26, 1952, the Congress then not being in session, I was given a recess appointment by President Truman as Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act.

After the elections, President-elect Eisenhower designated Gov. Harold Stassen as Mr. Harriman's successor. In December 1952, I talked with Governor Stassen. I said that the position I held was one involving extremely sensitive relations between the administration and the Congress, and that I felt that he should have his own appointee in the position. I stated my intention of resigning before the end of the Truman administration, but expressed my willingness to remain on as a consultant for an interim and transitional period. Governor Stassen concurred in my views, and asked me to remain as a consultant during a transitional period.

On January 5, 1953, I submitted my resignation to President Truman. On January 10, 1953, President Truman accepted my resignation, effective at the close of business on January 19, 1953.

When President Eisenhower took office, therefore, there should have been no appointment pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Apparently, however, a mistake was made, and appointment papers were in fact before the committee. When, in February of 1953, a United Press dispatch stated that my appointment was pending before the committee, I communicated with the White House, and steps were taken to correct the error. It is presumably to these steps—which were the withdrawal of an appointment to a position from which I had already resigned during the previous administration—that you referred in your statement of May 8.

So far as I know, there was never any consideration of my name, and never properly could have been any such consideration, before the Foreign Relations Committee. I have never heard of any slightest objection on the part of any Senator to my recess appointment, or criticism of my conduct of my office while I held it under that appointment. I append hereto copies of letters which I received, upon my resignation, from President Truman; from the Mutual Security Director Harriman; and from the United States Special Representative in Europe, Ambassador William H. Draper, Jr. I also append a copy of a letter received from Mr. Stassen, upon my subsequent resignation as a consultant.

I would appreciate your insertion of this letter, together with its attachments, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with such statement as you might at that time care to make.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR J. RUBIN,
Attorney at Law.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 13, 1953.

HON. SEYMOUR RUBIN,
Assistant Director for Mutual Security,
and Deputy Administrator for Mutual
Defense Assistance Control,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUBIN: In response to your letter of January 5, I accept your resignation as Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy Administrator for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, effective at the close of business January 19, 1953.

You have every reason to be proud of your record of Government service, particularly during the past year, when your contributions have been most valuable. As Chief of the United States delegation, you skillfully guided the negotiation of complex tax agreements with a number of European nations, required by the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

Subsequently, you served as Averell Harriman's deputy on matters pertaining to the complicated problem of controlling trade between free nations and the Soviet bloc. I especially appreciate your accepting this complex and difficult task. In the space of only a few months, you have provided vigorous direction to the efforts of the United States Government in this field and have laid a solid foundation upon which the executive branch and the Congress will more readily be able to move forward.

You have my every good wish for success in private life.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR FOR
MUTUAL SECURITY,
Washington, D. C. January 20, 1953.

MR. SEYMOUR RUBIN,
Deputy Administrator, Mutual Defense
Assistance Control Act, Executive Office
of the President, Office of the
Director for Mutual Security, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR SY: I want to record my appreciation for the effective work that you have done during these last months in the administration of the Battle Act.

I know that you came at considerable sacrifice to yourself, and I am deeply grateful to you. You had a penetrating understanding for the complicated problems that are involved in East-West trade, and brought to the administration a wise balance of all of the factors that relate to our security and national interests.

I send you all my best wishes and warm regards.

Sincerely,

W. A. HARRIMAN,
Director for Mutual Security.

UNITED STATES SPECIAL
REPRESENTATIVE IN EUROPE,
Paris, France, February 2, 1953.
The Honorable SEYMOUR J. RUBIN,
Deputy Administrator for Mutual De-
fense Assistance Control, Executive
Office of the President.

MY DEAR MR. RUBIN: Thank you very much for your letter of January 21 with which you enclosed a copy of the second semiannual report under the Battle Act.

I cannot let you leave office as Deputy Administrator for Mutual Defense Assistance Control without expressing my personal appreciation and thanks for the complete and continuous cooperation I personally, and all of us over here, have received from you and, in a very large measure, from your entire organization.

Your fine work in the mutual defense assistance control field, coupled with the outstanding job you did in obtaining relief for the United States from upwards of a

dozen different national governments in the tax field, make your record of public service an enviable one which you can look back on with a great deal of pride.

My personal association with you and with so many of your associates has been one of the most pleasurable aspects of my task over here. I hope very much that the association will continue and our paths cross frequently in the days to come.

With my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. DRAPER, JR.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1953.

MR. SEYMOUR J. RUBIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUBIN: Many thanks for your kind letter of August 26.

Be assured I have enjoyed very much working with you and thank you for your cooperation in these months of transition.

Renewed thanks and personal regards.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Director, Foreign Operations Admin-
istration.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish first to read from Mr. Rubin's letter, and then to make comments.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write on what I suppose might be called on the floor of the Senate a point of personal privilege. I believe you would want to correct an unfortunate inference, arising from your remarks of May 8, 1957, in regard to the McLeod appointment, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and/or the Eisenhower administration found me wanting in qualifications for the post of Assistant Director for Mutual Security.

I digress to point out, respectfully, that that was not my implication, and it was not my intention to leave that implication. On the other hand, if I were the appointee, I can well understand how Mr. Rubin might, at least, think there was some question as to the implication which was left in the RECORD. I certainly want any implication which Mr. Rubin thinks reflects on him to be corrected, and that is exactly what I propose to do. But I want Mr. Rubin and others to know that what I placed in the RECORD was a reference to his nomination which was contained in the memorandum prepared by the professional staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Mr. Rubin goes on to say:

The facts are:

I have been in the private practice of law since 1948. In 1951-52, I took on, at the request of the State Department and of Mutual Security Director Harriman, a short-term (2 month) negotiating job involving our relations with the NATO countries, and was fortunate enough to achieve the desired results. As a result, Mr. Harriman asked me, in the fall of 1952, to take on responsibility as his deputy for the Battle Act, with the title of Assistant Director for Mutual Security. I consented to do this, on the clear understanding that mine was again to be a short-term responsibility, that I would in any case resign in early 1953 to return to my law practice, and that the situation would be reexamined after the November 1952 elections.

On September 26, 1952, the Congress then not being in session, I was given a recess appointment by President Truman as Assistant Director for Mutual Security and Deputy

Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act.

After the elections, President-elect Eisenhower designated Gov. Harold Stassen as Mr. Harriman's successor. In December 1952, I talked with Governor Stassen. I said that the position I held was one involving extremely sensitive relations between the administration and the Congress, and that I felt that he should have his own appointee in the position. I stated my intention of resigning before the end of the Truman administration, but expressed my willingness to remain on as a consultant for an interim and transitional period. Governor Stassen concurred in my views, and asked me to remain as a consultant during a transitional period.

On January 5, 1953, I submitted my resignation to President Truman. On January 10, 1953, President Truman accepted my resignation, effective at the close of business on January 19, 1953.

When President Eisenhower took office, therefore, there should have been no appointment pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Apparently, however, a mistake was made, and appointment papers were in fact before the committee. When, in February of 1953, a United Press dispatch stated that my appointment was pending before the committee, I communicated with the White House, and steps were taken to correct the error. It is presumably to these steps—which were the withdrawal of an appointment to a position from which I had already resigned during the previous administration—that you referred in your statement of May 8.

I already have had the full letter printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in defense of the professional staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to say that my investigation shows they made a perfectly accurate report to the full committee. They reported only what the file showed. They were not aware of the background which Rubin points out in his letter, and therefore it was quite proper for them to make to the full committee the report in the official staff memorandum they filed. There was no intention on the part of any member of the professional staff of the Foreign Relations Committee to do any injury to Mr. Rubin.

I am very glad, however—as I always am, when any injury is being done any citizen because of any mistake of which I have knowledge which is made by anyone—to take this opportunity to make this statement, which I think corrects the record, and certainly does to Mr. Rubin the justice to which he is so clearly entitled.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE SPEECH BY SENATOR MORSE AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and the minority leader for granting me permission to fulfill a commitment I made to the Senate the other day, when I announced that today I would have ready a complete transcript of the tape recording of the speech I made in Detroit, at a Jefferson-Jackson day dinner on May 18,

1957, which speech caused me to be subjected to the attack which was leveled at me on the floor of the Senate a week ago Wednesday. When I said I would make the information available to the Senate today, I was not aware that there had been entered into an agreement to restrict the comments made today by Senators to insertions in the RECORD, under the 3-minute rule. The majority leader and the minority leader kindly agreed that today I should be allowed to make a statement not in excess of 30 minutes.

Mr. President, I shall make the statement without interruption, because I want it to appear in continuity in the RECORD. Then, if any Senator wishes to ask me questions about it, afterward, I shall be glad to yield for questions at that time.

Mr. President, I notify the Senate that what I shall now read into the RECORD is a complete transcript from the tape recording of my speech, of May 18, 1957, at the Jefferson-Jackson day dinner, at Detroit, Mich., dealing with the administration's handling of the Hells Canyon case, and with rapid tax writeoff benefits given to the Idaho Power Co. The press statements about this speech caused some of my colleagues in the Senate to make the criticisms and attacks on me which were made a week ago last Wednesday.

Mr. President, I shall now quote from the speech. I give the Senate my assurance that what I shall now read is the only part of the speech in which this matter was discussed. The tape is in my office, and is available to any Member of the Senate or to any member of the press who may wish to hear it. The speech was broadcast live from the banquet hall. A tape of the speech was taken by another radio station; and that tape was broadcast later on that evening or the next evening; at the moment, I am not sure whether it was broadcast on Saturday night or on the following evening, Sunday night.

I now quote from the speech:

I want to discuss this water resources issue from the standpoint, for example, of the Hells Canyon Dam issue. Why, there isn't one here who wouldn't be disappointed, I am sure, if I didn't mention Hells Canyon Dam. I want to mention Hells Canyon Dam as the great symbol of water conservation in America because it is a symbol of what ought to be. We must make it the natural resource policy of the Democratic Party, because it rests upon full development of a great river basin that has 60 percent, for example, of the potential hydroelectric power in this country. And the Eisenhower administration is cutting it down, if you follow their program, by about 50 percent. And what a shocking betrayal on the part of this administration of future generations of American boys and girls.

And the Hells Canyon Dam issue is but a repetition of the Grand Coulee issue. Don't forget, a group of bipartisan Senators—Republicans and Democrats—joined together when the private utility monopolies of this country tried to scuttle Grand Coulee. They had a friendly President in the White House, the great Franklin D. Roosevelt. They went to him and pointed out the private utility shell game. They pointed out that the private utilities were trying to build a low-head dam at Kettle Falls, and if they suc-

ceeded in building a low-head dam at Kettle Falls they would wash out Grand Coulee. And Roosevelt joined with these bipartisan Senators—Charlie McNary, of my State, a Republican; Hiram Johnson, of California, a Republican; Dill, of Washington, a Democrat; young Bob La Follette, of Wisconsin; the great George Norris, of Nebraska; and they stopped the scuttling of Grand Coulee.

The result was the greatest economic ally of the American people in World War II arose to its majesty, and without it you wouldn't have had either a great airplane armada program in World War II, nor would you have had a successful atomic energy program in World War II. And I do not intend to sit in the Senate and fail to give every effort within me of saving a great tragedy from occurring, that this Eisenhower administration is trying to foist upon the American people by its scuttling tactics on Hells Canyon Dam, because they are seeking to turn over to the Idaho Power Co. that reach of the Snake River, and if they succeed in doing it we cannot have full development, we cannot have adequate flood control, we cannot have the irrigation benefits we need.

And to tell you how far they are going, you need only look at the latest act of political immorality on the part of this administration, and I put it where it belongs, squarely on the shoulders of one man, the President himself. I do not join with Democrats that try to put the blame for the immorality of this administration upon underlings. I do not put the blame for this giveaway to the Idaho Power Co. of millions of dollars of your money, belonging to the taxpayers of this country, on one called Gray, who is the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The responsibility for it is the President's himself.

If you want to see a good example of political corruption, I give you the accelerated tax amortization scheme of the Eisenhower administration benefiting the private utilities of this country. Oh, says the President, when asked about it in a news conference the other day, he thought we ought to stop it. We ought to stop continuing these accelerated tax amortization certificates, but that what the Office of Defense Mobilization had done in connection with the Idaho Power Co. was within the law. It was perfectly legal. I taught law for many years, and I used to teach my students to remember that if you stay within the law, it doesn't mean necessarily that you have stayed within the realm of morality. [Applause.] The Eisenhower administration is doing its stealing within the law, but it is just as immoral because it knows it is betraying a public trust, and history will record that this President made an honest administration out of Harding, and a statesman out of Grant. That will be the record of this administration. [Applause.]

Take a look—take a look at this kind of political thievery in connection with these accelerated tax-amortization certificates. Why did we pass a law in the first place that permitted of this acceleration of taxpayment? In order to get industry to build plants that would be useless after the war. Read the congressional debate on accelerated tax amortization. That was the legislative purpose of this bill for accelerated tax amortization. But what the Eisenhower administration has been doing has been granting accelerated tax amortization to businesses in this country whose plants will be of greater value after they are built in peacetime than if put to defense purposes. And this administration cannot present a scintilla of evidence—and they didn't before the Byrd committee the other day—that would justify a tax certificate to the

Idaho Power Co. on the basis of its being a defense plant. It is a great private utility.

And what this handout of the Eisenhower administration amounts to is millions of dollars of an interest-free loan, of money belonging to you. And that is why, before the Kefauver committee yesterday, I said as far as the morality is concerned it is as immoral in my code of ethics as Dave Beck, who reaches into the pockets of the teamsters and takes out of them an interest-free loan for his own personal purpose, whereas this administration reaches into your pockets, takes an interest-free loan out of your pocket, and turns it over, gratis, to the Idaho Power Co. to the tune of a profit for that company on a 50-year basis at 6 percent, for example, of a great many millions of dollars. But, at the same time, remember you will be paying interest that your Treasury has to borrow in order to swing the kind of a tax loss that is Idaho Power Co. makes at your expense.

suffered as a result of the savings that the I think the time has come to call the hand of this administration, as I have been doing since 1953. That is why, for example, on the floor of the Senate I protested the appointment, for example, of Mr. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force, you will recall. I protested him because I read the record. Many of my colleagues didn't. And I found that his whole record was a record of conflict of interest, and I forewarned the Senate in that speech that if he was made Secretary of the Air Force we would have trouble with him over conflict of interest.

There it is, for history to read; and it wasn't very long, as DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, said on the floor of the Senate, that the prophecy of the Senator from Oregon came true.

But what did this administration do after they had to really force Talbott's resignation? They gave him a medal for meritorious service as Secretary of the Air Force. And that is when I walked on the floor of the Senate and said, "The President, instead of giving him a medal, ought to have given him a chisel."

In the minute remaining let me say likewise we must take the issue to them on the hard-money policy, because what they are doing is driving thousands of small businesses into bankruptcy with the result that you have the highest small business bankruptcy rate in the last 25 years going on today in the United States.

We have to take the fight to them on tax favoritism, to big business. We have to take the fight to them, let me tell you, on the budget. And let me make clear the military budget no longer must be allowed to be the sacred cow in American politics. It needs to be revised in the interests of millions of dollars of savings to the American taxpayers.

I close by asking you as Democrats to put on your fighting clothes, join the issue, and demonstrate to the American people that this administration must start to be driven out of office in 1958, and the job completed in 1960.

Mr. President, this morning, before the Kefauver committee, testimony was given by the chief accountant of the Federal Power Commission. I am informed that the questioning was started by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and I am informed the chief accountant of the Federal Power Commission testified along the same lines I followed in the changes I have been making in regard to the fast tax write-off to the Idaho Power Co. I am advised he testified that the interest costs to the Treasury, resulting from the loss of reve-

nue occasioned by the fast tax write-off to the Idaho Power Co., figured at an interest rate of 3½ percent, would be \$83 million. That is a little higher figure than I, myself, have used.

I am advised that the information obtained from the chief accountant of the Federal Power Commission at the hearing this morning was to the effect that the value of certificates to the company, based upon a 6 percent return, which he assumed to be a proper return, over the period of time covered, would amount, according to the accountant's information, to \$339 million. This is \$10 million higher than the figure I presented to the Senate on April 29.

So far as I am concerned, it is a very important issue, and likewise it is very important that, in the interest of the taxpayers, this kind of a giveaway program shall be brought to an end.

It is important that Congress enact, at the earliest possible date, legislation which will clarify, beyond any question of a doubt, the narrow limits within which tax certificates by way of fast tax writeoffs can be granted.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I shall be perfectly willing to be judged by history and by the American people for the fighting stand I have taken in the Senate of the United States, and outside the Senate, in opposition to the action of the Eisenhower administration in granting fast tax writeoffs and providing this bonanza benefit to the Idaho Power Co., while at the same time it has opposed full development with a high Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

I quite agree with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, in his letter of March 11, to Dr. Flemming, then Chairman of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I think he set forth a clear case against this writeoff.

I am very glad, Mr. President, that Secretary Seaton, relatively in the last few hours, or the last couple of days, has reaffirmed his own personal judgment about the matter. He has said what many of us have said. He has said, in effect, what many of us have said from the beginning, namely, that, so far as the letter of the law is concerned, Dr. Gray can justify granting the certificates; but, I repeat, Mr. President, that hiding behind the letter of the law does not justify what I consider to be immorality so far as acts against the American taxpayers are concerned. That kind of political immorality cannot be justified.

Mr. President, the other day, in an attack upon me, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] had much to say, as the RECORD will show, because I changed my judgment of candidate Eisenhower in 1952. The Senator from Indiana made some pretty strong statements in the RECORD, charging me with intellectual immorality and indulging in some other uncomplimentary and disrespectful references.

I think, therefore, Mr. President, that I ought to read into the RECORD a letter which the Senator from Indiana issued on May 23, 1952, and sent to Republicans in the United States in regard to his po-

sition with respect to candidate Eisenhower in 1952.

I am perfectly willing to stand by my change of opinion; and I am very glad if, since he wrote this letter, the Senator from Indiana has come to think more highly of the Republican candidate of 1952; but on May 23, 1952, he sent this letter to Republicans, a copy of which I received from a very prominent public official in the Middle West. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1952.

DEAR REPUBLICAN: I am writing this letter because I feel so deeply that the nomination of General Eisenhower would mean the end of the Republican Party. You have probably seen a copy of the Hall survey sent out by Professor Colegrove which shows how Eisenhower would lose support of a large percentage of his present followers if he took a position on many of the vital issues now before the people. It shows that from a popular candidate, he might become a weak candidate. It is significant that Lodge and Carlson and Duff and Hoffman, who are fronting for Eisenhower in the Republican Party, are urging him to keep still on every important issue until after the nomination. In response General Eisenhower has said as plain as day that he wouldn't say anything, and he won't even get out of uniform unless the Republicans nominate him in July. I am just one Republican, but I think every single Republican has the right to say to General Eisenhower that he cannot expect his support or his vote unless he tells him where he stands on the issues, and what kind of a campaign he will conduct.

There is another thing that a lot of the Eisenhower supporters keep mighty still about—we can't win with an amateur in politics. Campaigning is a mighty complicated matter that takes a terrific lot of experience and a lot of knowledge of the different parts of the country and the different groups to whom a candidate must appeal.

The first thing an amateur political aspirant is likely to do is to destroy the party organization. Both Landon and Willkie grew a lot weaker when they failed to recognize the importance of the many thousand party workers throughout the country. Nobody, from a precinct worker on up, knows where he stands or what the future of the party organization may be.

An inexperienced candidate can also destroy his candidacy with a single wrong answer when he is campaigning. Just think of a man trying to answer all the questions that arise in a political campaign when, even at this late date, he frankly says in a letter over his own signature that he doesn't know where he stands on Fair Employment Practices.

Senator Taft has never lost an election and has campaigned his way right up to the United States Senate and to the biggest plurality Ohio ever recorded for a Republican candidate for Senator. Furthermore, I have felt all along that if Senator Taft were nominated, he would be overwhelmingly elected because he knows the kind of campaign to win. What the Republican Party needs for victory is a fighting candidate who will make the issues against the Democratic New Deal, Fair Deal, Socialist, pro-Communist crowd in Washington. We have lost three straight presidential elections just for lack of such a fighting campaign. We can't win by approving the objectives of the New Deal and the Truman-Acheson foreign policy, and then trying to persuade the people that we will do it better. That is the kind of a campaign put on by Mr. Dewey, and I think it is the kind of campaign that General

Eisenhower would put on if he follows the advice of his present followers.

I want to tell you with all the sincerity of which I am capable that I firmly believe that Eisenhower is the Democratic candidate for the Republican nomination. They want to see him nominated, because if they can't beat him they feel that he would carry out practically the same policies in which they believe. I cannot conceive how any experienced political observer could fail to see that Eisenhower is the Democratic candidate for the Republican nomination. He is getting a buildup from every New Deal columnist, every New Deal editor, Jimmie Roosevelt, Elliott Roosevelt, Claude Pepper, Leon Henderson, and the billion-dollar-foreign-spender, Paul Hoffman. They apparently feel confident that if elected on any ticket, Eisenhower would continue the Truman-Acheson foreign policy and the high taxes, big spending and inflation policies here at home. It looks to me as if the Democrats are doing a swell job of trying to arrange so that both the Democratic and Republican Parties will have Democratic candidates so that they can't lose either way.

Look at Eisenhower's close personal advisers. He stayed with George Allen in Washington, and George Allen has gone to advise him in Paris. George Allen is Truman's old pal and side-kick, appointed to high office by Mr. Truman. Does anybody honestly think that Mr. Allen wants to help elect a Republican President? The Democrats, who have been putting out the propaganda that Eisenhower is the only man who can win for the Republicans, are trying to flood all the Republican primaries. If you have any doubts that the Democrats want us to nominate Eisenhower, the answer is that they are campaigning for him right now.

Every American citizen who applies for a passport to the United States State Department, headed by Mr. Acheson, gets a circular with Eisenhower's picture on the front cover and a story about what a great man he is.

The Post Office Department has just issued a NATO stamp to persuade the public that NATO is a tremendous success and that Eisenhower is its prophet.

Eisenhower had a close association with Roosevelt and Truman for many years. It was they who built him up to an international figure. He approved the policy of appeasing the Russians in Europe. He was Chief of Staff when Marshall and Acheson abandoned Chiang Kai-shek to the Communists in Asia.

I am willing to concede that Eisenhower is a brave general, but up to now he has been a very timid candidate. Unless we can nominate Taft we may not win, and unless we nominate Taft the New Deal is going to take over the Republican Party.

Sincerely,

HOMER CAPEHART.

That letter was written on stationery bearing the heading "United States Senate."

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the attack upon me on May 22, also had some uncomplimentary things to say because I had criticized the President. In order to keep the record straight, I think there should be in the RECORD a statement quoted from the New York Times of May 11, 1938, an Associated Press dispatch:

Senator H. STYLES BRIDGES today termed Government spending under the New Deal a vote-buying scheme and as put forth by the President of the United States nothing more than a national swindle. Senator BRIDGES asserted that many New Deal measures had

been intended to save President Roosevelt's face and added, "Not once has he admitted he was wrong. Not once in nearly 6 years has any proposal of Franklin D. Roosevelt ever been allowed to go sour. Something has always been done to save his face."

Then, in the Washington Star of April 16, 1952, the following story is attributed to the Senator from New Hampshire:

Senate Republican Leader BRIDGES today accused President Truman as having used a "trumped-up appeal" and "suspect" motives in seizing the steel industry. "The President's cry of emergency is as specious as his action without the basis of law," Senator BRIDGES charged. "It is clear that the President's appeal to emergency is a trumped-up appeal. It is clear that his motives are suspect."

Then in the Baltimore Sun of April 1, 1938, the following story is contained:

Through decentralization, said BRIDGES, President Roosevelt and his workers "should be shorn of the power * * * gained by usurpation, by coercion, by threats, by the sabotaging of independent commissions, by torpedoing civil service, and by making ridiculous trade treaties with foreign nations."

Then, from a summary of Republican accomplishments in the 82d Congress, written by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, quoted in the New York Herald Tribune of August 17, 1952, is the following:

Republicans want no more Truman wars like Korea where the Democrat President without authority of constitution or law plunged us into a bloody conflict.

These are only a few examples, Mr. President, of the exercise of free speech by a United States Senator in criticism of a President. I wish to say I shall defend that right when practiced by Republicans as well as when practiced by Democrats.

I close, Mr. President, by once again saying to the American people from the floor of the Senate today: Woe be unto America if this precious procedural protection of freedom in the United States is ever lost on the floor of the United States Senate. Woe be to freedom in America if the time ever comes when elected officials in the legislative branch of our Government are not free to walk on the floor of the Senate and utter criticisms of a President and other executive officers which in their honest judgment ought to be made, so that the American people can be forewarned of what is happening to them, in the minds of those who represent them in the Congress.

I wish to say I direct no criticism against the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the other Senators who Wednesday of last week attacked and criticized me. That is a precious right which I wish to guarantee to them, Mr. President. But I raise my voice once again in the Senate of the United States for the protection of untrammelled free speech, for conformance to what the constitutional fathers clearly intended when the Senate of the

United States was created because they were fearful of executive power. The constitutional fathers knew the danger of giving to the executive of any State unchecked and unbridled power. They knew that one of the greatest checks which could be provided in a democracy would be to confer the right on a United States Senator to stand on the floor of the Senate or off the floor of the Senate and communicate to the American people his sincere and honest judgment as to the course of action being followed by any administration, be it Republican or Democrat.

So far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, so long as he is entrusted with the great obligation now resting upon his shoulders, he intends to tell the American people from time to time when he thinks this administration or any future administration is following a course of action which can properly be described as an action and a course of political immorality.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of New Jersey in the chair). If there is no further business, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, June 3, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class one to the class of career minister:

Vinton Chapin, of New Hampshire.
John Wesley Jones, of Iowa.
Frederick B. Lyon, of Nevada.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward L. Scheufler, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 16, 1957.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Omar L. Schnatmeier, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 16, 1957.

Richard Beal Kidd, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Arkansas for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 31, 1957.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert Milchrist Cannon, O16163, United States Army, in the rank of Lieutenant general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to Our Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31, 1957

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on May 24, 1957, it was my privilege to attend the annual memorial services honoring Jewish War Veterans of the United States, held at Adas Israel Synagogue, Washington, D. C., and to take part in these memorial services. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR JEWISH WAR VETERANS

(Address by Senator THOS. E. MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa, at the annual memorial services honoring Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Adas Israel Synagogue, Washington, D. C., May 24, 1957)

It is a great honor to take part in these memorial services honoring the Jewish war dead. The ideals of your organization and the way in which you have carried these ideals into practice are eminently worthy of emulation.

Recently, I took the time to read part of the constitution of the Jewish War Veterans. I was particularly impressed by article II of this constitution. I would like to quote a portion of it:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to encourage honor and purity in public affairs; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of free institutions; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men.

* * * * *

"To instill love of country and flag in our youth and to foster such activities as will tend to perpetuate the objects and ideals of our organization."

The history of our country's struggle to secure and maintain the principles cited above is an inspiring story of purpose and devotion. The part played in these struggles by people of the Jewish faith is equally inspiring. From the first days of the Revolutionary War, American Jews have taken their place alongside men of all faiths and all beliefs in the common cause of freedom.

Early in our history the rumblings of freedom were heard in the Colonies. One of the first visible signs of the oncoming struggle was the Non-Importations Resolutions of 1765—the first real step toward independence—when a group of colonists indicated desire for freedom by refusing to trade with the English. It is highly significant that among the signers of these resolutions were nine Jews whose principal livelihood depended on such trade. Six Jews signed the more stringent agreement of 1770. But they took this action without fear because of their faith in the ideals of liberty and freedom.

When the fight for independence turned into actual war, the Jews of the Colonies carried their share of the burdens. Deeply etched on the rolls of the Revolutionary heroes are such names as Lt. Col. David Salisbury Franks who served with great distinction; Lt. Col. Isaac Franks, an aide-de-camp

to General Washington; Mordecai Sheftall, who put his entire salary at the disposal of the Army physicians for the purchase of much-needed medicines and was badly wounded at the siege of Savannah; Manual Mordecai who also served on Washington's staff and who gave a fortune of \$100,000 for the cause of independence; and Haym Salomon who was arrested by the British as an American spy and who later extended financial help to James Madison, Edmond Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, Arthur Lee, General Steuben, and Robert Morris and still later became the financial link between the United States and Europe. The Jews truly contributed their share of sacrifice and valor to the infant United States.

That the Hebrew played a conspicuous part in the drama of the Revolution, despite the relatively small size of his community, there can be little doubt. His aid was both military and financial. The record reads creditably on both counts.

When the tragic War Between the States broke out, Jews were found on both sides fighting for the causes in which they believed. Simon Wolf, who made an exhaustive study of that war, estimates that 8,400 Jews served with the northern army, and it was reported that John Seddon, Confederate Secretary of War, one time said there were between 10,000 and 12,000 Jews serving in the Confederate Army.

Although it is impossible to estimate accurately the total number of Jews who served in the War Between the States, some of the names and deeds of fighting Jews will live forever—names like Leopold Karpeles, who turned a retreat into a victory at the Battle of the Wilderness by rallying the northern soldiers; Benjamin Levy, the 16-year-old drummer boy who won the Congressional Medal of Honor for his bravery at the Battle of Charles City Crossroads; Leopold Blumenberg, about whom Lincoln once said, "He has suffered for us and served us well, had the rope around his neck for being our friend, raised troops, fought and been wounded"; and Edward Solomon, who served with great courage and valor at Gettysburg.

On and on this list of Jews who fought so gallantly could go. In each war there were Jews, great numbers of Jews, who compiled records that rank with America's bravest.

More than 1 million Jews have served in our Armed Forces in our country's wars. The list of Jewish heroes could go on for hours and we still wouldn't list them all. While we cannot possibly list all the Jewish heroes of World War I and World War II and Korea, we can pay special tribute to Chaplain Alexander D. Goode who, together with three other chaplains, two of the Protestant faith and one of the Catholic faith, gave their lives in the sinking of the *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic early in World War II. The story of Chaplain Goode and his fellow ministers of religion, Chaplains Clark V. Poling and George L. Fox, Protestant ministers, and Chaplain John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, is an epic of human dignity and sacrifice. As a lifeboat drew away from the stricken *Dorchester*, a young sailor who knew the four chaplains had given their life preservers to four enlisted men, saw them locked arm in arm and deep in prayer. And then suddenly the men and the ship were gone—gone beneath the icy waves.

In the First World War there were 3 Medal of Honor winners, 1 of whom is your genial and able national executive director, Ben Kaufman, 147 winners of Distinguished Service Crosses and Medals, and 982 other decorations, citations, and awards that were given to American Jews. In World War II, 2 more Jews won the Nation's highest award for bravery, the Congressional Medal of Honor,

64 men who won the Distinguished Service Cross, 27 who won the Navy Cross, and 34 who received the Distinguished Service Medal. In addition to this inspiring list there were actually thousands of additional awards and citations given to men of Jewish faith who served with distinction in the Second World War.

I have not been able to secure a breakdown of the decorations won by Jewish servicemen in the Korean conflict, but I am confident when the full story is written the pattern of service and patriotism forged by Americans of the Jewish faith in all our wars will be reproduced.

Perhaps the best description of the place of the Jew in the military history of the United States was made by Congressman Julius Kahn, of California, when he drew the first draft number for the First World War. I would like to repeat to you what he said:

"Many of the boys who go to the front will be wounded. Many of them will be killed. But Jews at all periods of the world's history have been ready to make the supreme sacrifice whenever the land that gives them shelter demands it. I know that I voice the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the Jews of the United States when I say we will do our share toward keeping Old Glory floating proudly in the skies so that it may continue to shelter under its fold the down-trodden and the oppressed of every land."

The Jews of our country have always upheld the high appraisal of Congressman Kahn. Your record of sacrifice for the country you love has been far and beyond the call of duty. I consider it an honor to meet with you today.

International Atomic Energy Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 31, 1957

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address entitled "Approval of Atomic Energy Essential to United States Leadership," delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] to the New Jersey Young Republicans in Atlantic City, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 25, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROVAL OF ATOMIC AGENCY ESSENTIAL TO UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP

(By Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE)

The following are excerpts from a speech by Senator CASE delivered recently to the New Jersey Young Republicans in Atlantic City:

"Nearly three and a half years ago President Eisenhower appeared before the United Nations and pledged this Nation to find the way by which nuclear forces could be dedicated to the benefit, not destruction, of man.

"His words sparked new hope throughout the world. Thus was launched an effort that is more than a key feature of the President's foreign policy. In a very real sense, it is key to our future and that of every man.

"For many years following the war the United States labored to bring about a system of international control of atomic energy. Those efforts were unavailing, primarily because of Soviet refusal to agree to effective control measures such as inspection.

"It was against this background that the President made his historic address in December 1953. He suggested a new effort that would concentrate on the peaceful uses of the atom. From his suggestion, over long months of negotiation, has developed the International Atomic Energy Agency. Last October the draft statute of the Agency was adopted unanimously by an 81-nation conference. Recently, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opened hearings looking toward ratification by the Senate. Prompt ratification by the United States is, I believe, of the utmost importance.

"At this point in history the United States no longer has a monopoly of the nuclear energy field. A number of nations including, of course, the U. S. S. R., are engaged in nuclear development. Many others, especially the underdeveloped nations are eagerly seeking an opportunity to avail themselves of the marvelous benefits the atom can bring.

"The question is whether the United States will join with other nations in an effort to insure that the development of peaceful uses

of the atom will go forward in ways which will best serve our interests and the peace of the world.

"We are faced with an opportunity that is unlikely to come again. For the first time there has been achieved well-nigh universal agreement on a plan of development and control in the atomic energy field and fortunately this comes at a time when relatively few nations are yet engaged in weapons development. We have an opportunity for leadership. If we forego that opportunity, we run the risk that others—of whose basic hostility to our way of life there can be no doubt—will exploit our failure to take the lead.

"What of the risks, it is asked, that are involved in membership in this new Agency? To that I can only say I have been unable to discover any substantial risk that can be avoided by refusing to join the Agency.

"The draft statute specifically forbids the use for military purposes of fissionable material supplied through the International Atomic Energy Agency. To insure the effectiveness of this prohibition, a comprehensive system of safeguards is provided. These safeguards are the equal, indeed the same I am informed, of any the United States now prescribes in its bilateral atomic agreements with other nations.

"Among the most important of the safeguards is the right of inspection, of free ac-

cess by Agency personnel to all places, persons and data having to do with a project. This means, of course, that like any other country that seeks Agency assistance, any applicant among the Soviet satellite countries will have to submit the projects for approval and agree to continuous inspection and accountability procedures. This would at least open a window on an area now cut off from our view, though not from a major source of nuclear materials and technology.

"Qualified technical experts state that diversion of fissionable materials of the quality specified to military purposes would be most difficult, if not impossible, to achieve clandestinely. At the same time the strict accountability features in conjunction with other technical factors and the requirement that excess material be stored in Agency storehouses make it most unlikely that diversion could be accomplished secretly.

"We can refuse to join the IAEA but this does not mean we can stop the drive of other nations to secure for themselves the benefits of atomic energy. Or we can ratify the Charter and take the lead in establishing what the President has called 'an international body in which all may safely pool their knowledge and skill for the advancement of all.'

"To me the choice seems clear. We, no less than other nations, want and need 'this new instrument of peaceful progress.'

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who commandest the morning, and by whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening, open our ears, we beseech Thee, to hear the call of far horizons and the stirring trumpets of challenge sounding the advance to a new era for mankind when the vast treasure now being paid out for defensive armaments may be channeled into avenues which shall build and not blight. As we wrestle with powers of darkness which deny the divine sovereignty and human dignity, may the reality of the faith by which we live blaze with a new fire and luster. With the faith of our fathers revitalized to a new intensity, make us more and more alert to the spiritual values that underlie all the struggle of these epic days which are molding the shape of tomorrow's world.

In this forum of the Republic, as these elected representatives of perplexed and anxious millions debate problems of human relationships which confront and almost confound them, quicken and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good their best endeavors: in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1957, and Friday, May 31, 1957, was approved, and reading was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSOLIDATION OF LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 338, House bill 53. My purpose in making this request is to have the bill made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 53) to consolidate into one act, and to simplify and make more uniform, the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, hospitalization, and burial benefits, and to consolidate into one act the laws pertaining to the administration of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 53) to consolidate into one act, and to simplify and make more uniform, the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, hospitalization, and burial benefits, and to consolidate into one act the laws pertaining to the administration of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar today, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.